

## Le repas de Ex 24,11

“[Les notables d’Israël] contemplèrent Dieu, ils mangèrent et ils burent” (Ex 24,11b). Un bon nombre de commentateurs a vu dans cette brève description un repas d’alliance entre YHWH et les notables d’Israël, en l’occurrence, Moïse, Aaron, Nadab, Abiu et soixante-dix parmi les anciens d’Israël (Ex 24,1.9)<sup>(1)</sup>. De fortes réserves ont été exprimées à ce sujet, mais plusieurs exégètes continuent à professer cette opinion. Est-il possible de dirimer la question? Et si la réponse est négative, comment interpréter le texte? Après un bref état de la question, nous examinerons les différentes solutions du problème avant de proposer une interprétation, puis une datation du texte.

### I. Les diverses propositions

#### 1. *Le repas d’alliance*<sup>(2)</sup>

Cette opinion se trouve déjà chez H. Greßmann et elle a été souvent reprise depuis<sup>(3)</sup>. Elle s’appuie sur quelques textes bibliques

<sup>(1)</sup> Pour un bref état de la question, voir E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin – New York 1990) 53 (bibliographie n. 31). Les principaux auteurs seront cités dans les notes suivantes.

<sup>(2)</sup> Par alliance nous entendons l’établissement d’une relation nouvelle entre personnes ou groupes de personnes par un acte public et sanctionné formellement. Pour plus de détails, voir *infra*, n. 17.

<sup>(3)</sup> Voir H. GREßMANN, *Mose und seine Zeit*. Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen (FRLANT 18; Göttingen 1913) 183; J. PEDERSEN, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamitischen Orients 3 (Straßburg 1914) 24-27 (parallèles); 48; id., *Israel. Its Life and Culture I-II* (London – Copenhagen 1946) 305-306; W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen* (Tübingen 1961) 40-42; T. C. VRIEZEN, «The Exegesis of Exodus xxiv 9-11», *The Witness of Tradition* (OTS 17; Leiden 1972) 100-133, sp. 112-113; D. J. MCCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament (AnBib 21A; Rome 1978) 254, n. 19 (parallèles); 265-266; R. SMEND, «Essen und Trinken – ein Stück Weltlichkeit des Alten

et quelques parallèles non bibliques. Les textes bibliques sont au nombre de trois: Gn 26,26-30; 31,44-54 et Ex 18,12<sup>(4)</sup>. Les parallèles non bibliques proviennent des cultures bédouines et arabes<sup>(5)</sup>.

Gn 26 et 31 parlent explicitement d'un repas qui scelle une alliance et le mot *berît* apparaît chaque fois dans le contexte. Qu'en est-il de Ex 24? Les objections sont nombreuses. En fait, a-t-on dit, le repas *peut* faire partie d'un cérémonial d'alliance, mais il ne *doit* pas en être nécessairement ainsi<sup>(6)</sup>. De plus, rien dans le contexte des vv. 9-11 n'indique qu'il s'agit d'une alliance, comme c'est le cas pour Gn 26,26.30 ou 31,44.54<sup>(7)</sup>. Dieu ne participe pas au repas, comme le font Abimélek ou Laban et leurs hommes (Gn 26,30; 31,54) et il ne s'agit pas de sacrifices de communion (cf. Gn 31,54)<sup>(8)</sup>. Des sacrifices sont offerts, mais en Ex 24,5, unité

---

Testaments», *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (FS. W. Zimmerli) (Göttingen 1977) 446-459, sp. 455-456 = *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments. Gesammelte Studien I* (BeT 99; München 1986) 200-211; N. LOHFINK, *Studien zum Deuteronomium I* (SBA 8; Stuttgart 1990) 357.

Parmi les commentaires plus anciens, voir H. HOLZINGER, *Exodus* (KHAT 2; Tübingen 1900) 106; B. BAENTSCH, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri* (HAT I,2; Göttingen 1903) 216; M. NOTH, *Das zweite Buch des Mose. Exodus* (ATD 5; Göttingen 1959) 159.

Parmi les commentaires récents, voir B.S. CHILDS, *Exodus. A Commentary* (London – Philadelphia 1974) 498, 507, 509; F. MICHAËLI, *Le livre de l'Exode* (CAT II; Neuchâtel – Paris 1974) 227; J.I. DURHAM, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco 1987) 345 (avec quelques nuances); J. SCHARBERT, *Exodus* (NEB; Würzburg 1989) 100.

<sup>(4)</sup> Sur Gn 26 et 31, voir en particulier D.J. MCCARTHY, «Three Covenants in Genesis», *CBQ* 26 (1964) 179-189; sur Ex 18,12, voir A. CODY, «Exodus 18,12: Jethro Accepts a Covenant with the Israelites», *Bib* 49 (1968) 153-166.

<sup>(5)</sup> MCCARTY, *Treaty*, 254, sp. n.19. Pour les Bédouins, voir G. QUELL, «*diathēkē*», *TWNT* II, 106-137, sp. 121-124; pour les Arabes, voir PEDERSEN, *Eid*, 24-26. Pour les parallèles du Proche-Orient ancien, voir VRIEZEN, «Exegesis», 112, n. 1 et 2.

<sup>(6)</sup> E.W. NICHOLSON, «The Interpretation of Exodus xxiv 9-11», *VT* 24 (1974) 77-97, sp. 86.

<sup>(7)</sup> L. PERLITT, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 187-188; E. KUTSCH, *Verheißung und Gesetz. Untersuchungen zum sogenannten «Bund» im Alten Testament* (BZAW 131; Berlin – New York 1973) 89.

<sup>(8)</sup> PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 187; NICHOLSON, «Interpretation», 86-87.

indépendante de Ex 24,9-11<sup>(9)</sup>. Quant aux sacrifices de Ex 18,12, ils sont suivis d'un repas en présence de Dieu — *lipnê hā'ēlōhîm* — et le contexte ne contient aucune allusion à une alliance<sup>(10)</sup>. Il n'est pas non plus possible d'interpréter 24,11 en fonction de 24,3-8 et de dire, par exemple, que le repas du v.11 doit être compris comme la conclusion solennelle de l'alliance de 24,8. Pourquoi le repas ne suit-il pas immédiatement l'alliance, comme en Gn 26,30 et 31,54? Pourquoi tout le peuple n'y participe-t-il pas? Pourquoi faut-il que les notables montent sur la montagne<sup>(11)</sup>? Ces objections ont convaincu des exégètes de diverses tendances<sup>(12)</sup>.

(<sup>9</sup>) Les commentateurs sont à peu près unanimes à ce sujet. Dans le discours divin des versets 1-2\*, Dieu commande à Moïse, Aaron, Nadab, Abiu et soixante-dix parmi les anciens de monter sur la montagne. Cet ordre est exécuté au v. 9 qui mentionne à nouveau les personnages du v. 1. Les versets 10-11 décrivent ce qui s'est passé sur la montagne, la vision et le repas. Quant aux vv. 3-8, ils interrompent cette unité en introduisant une scène dont le contenu, les personnages et le cadre sont différents. On y assiste à une proclamation de la volonté divine suivie d'une réponse du peuple, à une liturgie sacrificielle accompagnée d'une asperision de sang, le tout présenté comme la conclusion solennelle d'une alliance. Moïse est seul face au peuple et il n'est assisté que par les « jeunes gens » du v. 5. Le tout se déroule au pied de la montagne. Voir entre autres BAENTSCH, *Exodus*, 213; PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 182; NICHOLSON, « Interpretation », 78-79. Pour les quelques voix discordantes (les Targums, Ibn Ezra, Cassuto, Abrahams), voir NICHOLSON, « Interpretation », 78, n. 1 et 86, n. 1.

(<sup>10</sup>) PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 188; NICHOLSON, « Interpretation », 87.

(<sup>11</sup>) NICHOLSON, « Interpretation », 88; E. RUPRECHT, « Exodus 24,9-11 als Beispiel lebendiger Erzähltradition aus der Zeit des babylonischen Exils », *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments* (FS. C. Westermann) (Göttingen – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980) 138-173, sp. 139-140. Ce dernier insiste sur la difficulté méthodologique qui consiste à s'appuyer sur 24,3-8 pour interpréter 24,9-11. Ex 24,3-8 est plus récent que 24,1\*9-11 et ne peut donc avoir eu d'influence sur la composition et le sens de ce dernier.

(<sup>12</sup>) E. W. NICHOLSON, « The Origin of the Tradition in Exodus xxiv 9-11 », *VT* 26 (1976) 148-160, sp. 148-150; id., *God and His People. Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford 1986) 131-132; P. WELTEN, « Die Vernichtung des Todes und die Königsherrschaft Gottes. Eine traditionsgehistorische Studie zu Jes 25,6-8; 24,21-23 und Ex 24,9-11 », *TZ* 38 (1982) 129-146, sp. 141; BLUM, *Studien*, 53; B. RENAUD, *La théophanie du Sinaï: Ex 19-24. Exégèse et théologie* (CRB 30; Paris 1991) 120-122, 177.

D'autres textes ont été invoqués à l'appui de la thèse, mais ils sont tout aussi problématiques. Ils ont été joints au dossier parce que les « anciens » y interviennent d'une manière ou d'une autre comme en Ex 24,1.9. Jos 9,14 mentionne un repas entre les Israélites et les Gabaonites dans le cadre de l'alliance que Josué a conclue avec ces derniers (9,15)<sup>(13)</sup>. Mais la nourriture apportée par les Gabaonites avait pour but de convaincre Israël qu'ils étaient venus de loin: le pain est rassis et en miettes, tout comme les outres de vin sont déchirées, leurs vêtements et leurs sandales usés (9,12-13; cf. 9,8-11). Si les Israélites prennent de la nourriture, c'est pour vérifier les dires des Gabaonites et non pour conclure une alliance. La seconde partie du v. 14 le confirme: ils mangèrent, mais ils ne consultèrent pas YHWH. Ils ont fait leur propre enquête en prenant la nourriture offerte et ils ont été trompés par la ruse des Gabaonites parce qu'ils n'en ont pas référé à YHWH. Tout le v. 14 parle d'une opération préliminaire à l'alliance qui explique pourquoi Israël s'est laissé duper. L'alliance elle-même, cependant, n'est conclue qu'au v. 15. Par conséquent, il ne peut être question de repas d'alliance dans ce passage.

2 S 3,17-21 contient plusieurs éléments parallèles à Ex 24,9-11: les anciens (2 S 3,17), le banquet (3,20) et l'alliance (3,21). Cependant, 2 S 3,20-21 ne décrit pas une conclusion d'alliance, mais bien plutôt une rencontre au cours de laquelle Abner *propose* à David de lui amener tout Israël pour conclure une alliance entre les tribus du Nord et le futur roi (3,21). Le texte parle d'un banquet offert par David à Abner (3,20) et du fait qu'Abner put partir « en paix » (3,21), mais nullement d'une alliance entre les deux<sup>(14)</sup>.

2 S 5,1-3, l'alliance entre David et les tribus du Nord à Hébron, ne contient aucune allusion à un repas<sup>(15)</sup>. Le v. 3 dit seulement que l'alliance a été conclue « devant YHWH », ce qui ne signifie en aucune façon qu'il y ait eu sacrifice ou repas.

D'autres exégètes ont répondu en s'appuyant principalement sur le contexte. Ainsi, certains ont affirmé qu'il ne faut pas négliger l'aspect de communication non verbale<sup>(16)</sup>. L'alliance de Ex 24,11

<sup>(13)</sup> VRIEZEN, « Exegesis », 112. Les Gabaonites sont envoyés par les « anciens » (9,11).

<sup>(14)</sup> SMEND, « Essen und Trinken », 456.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. VRIEZEN, « Exegesis », 112.

<sup>(16)</sup> MCCARTHY, *Treaty*, 254, n. 19.



est implicite dans le geste lui-même du repas. Il est vrai qu'un repas implique nécessairement un aspect humain et si le repas est exceptionnel, il implique une relation tout aussi exceptionnelle entre les convives. Le contenu de cette dernière n'est pas toujours explicité par un discours direct. Cependant, la relation qui s'établit entre les convives peut être de différents types, selon le contexte, et l'alliance formelle n'est qu'une des possibilités à envisager dans l'analyse. Ce qui caractérise l'alliance est l'engagement explicite des partenaires et cet engagement est d'ordre juridique<sup>(17)</sup>. Or, rien en Ex 24,11 n'indique qu'il y ait un acte de ce type. Les acteurs de la scène restent cois et le narrateur n'offre aucun commentaire qui aille dans ce sens. Il n'y a donc pas d'indice indubitable pour dire que le repas est un repas d'alliance, à l'exclusion d'autres interprétations, à moins que l'on ne donne au mot «alliance» un sens très large comme «établissement d'une relation entre partenaires qui n'ont entre eux aucun lien de sang». Dans ce cas, toutefois, le terme perd beaucoup de sa précision et de son utilité.

Le débat peut cependant rebondir, car certains affirment que Ex 24,3-8 et 24,9-11 ont pu être composés l'un en fonction de l'autre et, par conséquent, l'idée d'alliance de l'un s'étend aussi à l'autre<sup>(18)</sup>. Malgré tout, il faut avouer que si le travail rédactionnel a voulu faire des vv.9-11 la conclusion solennelle de l'alliance du v.8, cela n'apparaît pas clairement. Que manque-t-il à cette alliance après la déclaration de Moïse au v.8? La plupart des récits d'alliance se terminent en effet sans repas<sup>(19)</sup>. De plus, divers éléments restent sans explication: le repas est différé, à l'encontre de ce qui se passe en Gn 31,54, par exemple; il a lieu sur la montagne et non là où furent offerts les sacrifices; tout le peuple est entré dans l'alliance,

<sup>(17)</sup> MCCARTHY, *Treaty*, 10: «At least the word [treaty or covenant] does imply a link, something more than mere sufferance or friendship, between relatively sovereign societies *defined and codified in writing*» (nous soulignons). La définition s'applique aussi à des individus qui peuvent créer des relations qui ne sont pas données par la nature, c'est-à-dire par des liens de sang. Ces relations sont «...*defined and visibly accepted*» (21) (nous soulignons). L'explication de Ex 24,11 proposée par McCarthy correspond difficilement à sa propre définition de l'alliance.

<sup>(18)</sup> N. LOHFINK, «Bundestheologie im Alten Testament», *Studien zum Deuteronomium I* (SBA 8; Stuttgart 1990) 357.

<sup>(19)</sup> Gn 9,12-17; 15,18; 21,27.32; Jos 9,15; 24,25; 1 S 18,3; 2 S 5,3; 2 R 11,17; 23,3.... Gn 26,30; 31,54 font figure d'exceptions.

mais seul un groupe de privilégiés participe au repas; le repas est précédé par une vision.

Il reste encore un dernier argument d'ordre théologique en faveur de l'hypothèse du repas d'alliance. Si Dieu n'y participe pas, c'est parce qu'il est impensable qu'un récit raconte jamais un fait de ce genre<sup>(20)</sup>. Mais alors, il faut se demander pourquoi un signe aussi ambigu aurait été choisi sans que le narrateur ne prenne la peine de préciser son intention. Ou bien Dieu prend part au repas pour sceller l'alliance, comme dans les textes parallèles, ou bien le texte suggère d'une façon ou d'une autre qu'il s'agit d'une vraie célébration de l'alliance bien que Dieu ne soit pas l'un des convives. Or, nous n'avons ni l'un ni l'autre en Ex 24,11. En outre, il manque un vrai parallèle où un repas en présence de Dieu fasse clairement partie d'un rituel d'alliance. Il faudra donc aussi abandonner cette piste.

## 2. *Le repas cultuel*

Il est possible de voir dans ce repas un rite analogue à celui qui est plus d'une fois mentionné dans les lois du Deutéronome, comme Dt 12,7.18; 14,26; 27,7; voir aussi 1 Ch 29,22. A ces textes s'ajoute Ex 18,12, dont nous avons déjà parlé<sup>(21)</sup>. Dans tous ces cas, des sacrifices sont offerts, l'on mange et l'on se réjouit «devant YHWH» (*lipnê yhw̄h*) ou «devant Dieu» (*lipnê hā'ēlōhîm*, seulement en Ex 18,12). Le sens de l'expression «ils virent Dieu, ils mangèrent et ils burent» serait simplement: «ils virent Dieu et se réjouirent» ou bien: «ils virent Dieu et adorèrent»<sup>(22)</sup>. Certains vont plus loin encore et voient dans le repas de Ex 24,11 une cérémonie liturgique, un repas cultuel et même sacrificiel (*zebah*)<sup>(23)</sup>.

<sup>(20)</sup> VRIEZEN, «Exegesis», 112-113.

<sup>(21)</sup> NICHOLSON, «Interpretation», 93-94. Même idée chez RENAUD, *Théophanie*, 178.

<sup>(22)</sup> NICHOLSON, «Interpretation», 94. Voir aussi PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 188 et les auteurs cités par BLUM, *Studien*, 53, n. 31.

<sup>(23)</sup> BLUM, *Studien*, 53: «ein gottesdienstliches Festmahl, ein *zebah*»; RENAUD, *Théophanie*, 177: «une célébration festive où s'exprime la communion avec Dieu». Déjà Ramban pensait que les notables d'Israël avaient consommé au pied de la montagne, à leur retour, la viande des sacrifices de communion offerts en 24,5. Voir RAMBAN (NACHMANIDES), *Commentary of the Torah. Exodus*. Translated and Annotated by C. B. Chavel (New York 1973) 429-430.

Cette explication fait cependant difficulté, car dans tous les exemples précités, le repas suit un acte sacrificiel. Or, il n'y a pas de sacrifices en Ex 24,9-11 et il n'est pas possible d'invoquer ceux de Ex 24,5, qui, répétons-le, appartiennent à un autre récit<sup>(24)</sup>.

### 3. *Manger et vivre*

S'il est difficile de parler d'un repas cultuel au sens strict, une autre explication va dans le même sens, tout en restant plus générale. En partant de textes comme 1 R 4,20; Jr 22,15; Qo 5,17, et peut-être Am 7,12, il est possible d'interpréter l'expression «manger et boire» dans le sens de «mener un train de vie prospère», «jouir de la vie» ou, plus simplement, «vivre»<sup>(25)</sup>.

Cette exégèse se base en outre sur le possible parallélisme entre deux paires d'expressions: «ils virent le Dieu d'Israël» et «il ne porta pas la main sur les notables d'Israël» d'une part, et «ils contemplèrent Dieu» et «ils mangèrent et ils burent», de l'autre<sup>(26)</sup>. Le syntagme «ils mangèrent et ils burent» correspondrait donc à «il ne porta pas la main sur les notables d'Israël». En d'autres termes, le fait de manger et de boire signifie que les notables ont pu survivre en présence de Dieu, alors que, selon la conception biblique, la vision de Dieu engendre la mort<sup>(27)</sup>.

L'idée a toutefois suscité quelques réticences. Ne risque-t-on pas de confondre une connotation avec le sens premier du texte<sup>(28)</sup>? Et le *parallelismus membrorum* n'est pas parfait. Les deux membres sont de dimensions inégales et le v. 10b est exclu de la construction

<sup>(24)</sup> NICHOLSON, «Origin», 148-149; id., *God and His People*, 131-132, qui corrige ainsi sa première opinion. La proposition de S. MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium 1,1-6,3 literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 139; Berlin 1975) 153-154, qui voit en 24,9.11b la continuation de 24,4aß.6, est difficilement défendable. Le binôme «manger et boire» n'est présent que dans un seul texte cultuel (1 Ch 29,22). Tous les textes parlant d'un repas cultuel précisent qu'il a lieu «devant YHWH» (*lipné yhwh*), expression absente de Ex 24,11; voir Dt 12,7.18; 14,26; 27,7; 1 Ch 29,22; cf. Ex 18,12. Enfin, comment concilier la vision avec l'hypothèse d'un repas cultuel? Nous ne mentionnons pas les difficultés que comporte le découpage lui-même.

<sup>(25)</sup> NICHOLSON, «Origin», 149; id., *God and His People*, 131-132.

<sup>(26)</sup> NICHOLSON, «Origin», 149-150; id., *God and His People*, 131-132.

<sup>(27)</sup> Ex 33,20; Dt 5,24; Jg 6,22-23; 13,22-23; Is, 6,5...

<sup>(28)</sup> BLUM, *Studien*, 53, n. 31.

(«et il y avait sous ses pieds comme un ouvrage de carreaux de lazulite...»)(<sup>29</sup>). A cela s'ajoute une autre objection. Les récits bibliques décrivent en général d'une manière bien différente la réaction de ceux qui ont pu survivre à une vision de ce genre(<sup>30</sup>). Il faudra donc chercher ailleurs.

## II. La fonction de la vision et du repas

Deux thèmes se retrouvent unis dans ces versets, la vision et le repas. Peut-être convient-il de les analyser ensemble et de voir s'ils ne peuvent avoir une fonction similaire.

### 1. *La vision*

La *visio Dei* n'est guère développée. Le texte emploie cependant les deux verbes usuels dans ce cas, *r'h* (v. 10) et *hzh* (v. 11). Le narrateur n'a retenu que deux détails de cette vision. D'abord, les notables ont vu le pavement sous les pieds divins. Ensuite, il est dit explicitement que Dieu n'a pas porté la main sur eux (v. 11a). Ils ont pu survivre à cette expérience exceptionnelle, comme Jacob, Gédéon, les parents de Samson ou Isaïe (Gn 32,31; Jg 6,22-23; 13,22-23; Is 6,5). En termes plus simples, Dieu les a reçus dans son palais sans que rien de fâcheux ne leur arrive.

#### a. Le milieu prophétique

Or, la *visio Dei* est un privilège accordé d'abord et avant tout aux prophètes. Elle fait partie de plusieurs récits de vocation dont le but est de légitimer une parole prophétique ou la mission prophétique comme telle. Ces récits ont été appelés «récits d'investiture» parce que leur but est de décrire quand et comment Dieu a conféré à certaines personnes une dignité et une mission particulières, celle de conseillers, de messagers ou de mandataires, et les a revêtus d'une autorité divine(<sup>31</sup>). La vision est l'un des éléments qui authentifient

(<sup>29</sup>) RENAUD, *Théophanie*, 122-123.

(<sup>30</sup>) Cf. Gn 32,31; Jg 6,22; 13,22; Is 6,5. Voir aussi Ex 20,18-19.

(<sup>31</sup>) N. HABEL, «The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives», *ZAW* 77 (1965) 297-323, dit en conclusion: «Thus the word of the call narrative gives the individual's credentials as a prophet, messenger and ambassador from the heavenly council. This word summarizes the ultimate commission from Master» (323). Voir aussi K. BALTZER, *Die Biographie*

l'envoyé de Dieu. Les exemples les plus connus sont ceux d'Isaïe et de Michée ben Yimlah<sup>(32)</sup>. Is 6,1-11 et 1 R 22,19-22 comportent d'ailleurs plus d'un élément commun<sup>(33)</sup>. Le fait d'avoir «vu» (Is 6,1; 1 R 22,19) authentifie la mission d'Isaïe et le message de Michée. Dans le cas de Michée, le prophète peut rapporter ce qu'il a entendu des délibérations du conseil divin. Is 6,5 insiste sur le sentiment d'indignité qui s'empare du prophète à la vue de son Seigneur (6,1). Un séraphin vient alors purifier ses lèvres pour le rendre apte à se tenir en présence du «roi Seigneur des armées» (6,5-7). Il peut «voir» et «entendre», comme l'atteste le verset suivant: «Et j'entendis la voix du Seigneur qui disait: 'Qui enverrai-je?'» (6,8). A présent, le prophète peut devenir messenger. La mission se fonde sur la vérité de cette expérience visuelle et auditive<sup>(34)</sup>.

Les récits de Ex 3,1-4,17 et Jg 6,11-24 ont eux aussi une fonction d'authentification. Ils légitiment la mission de Moïse et de Gédéon<sup>(35)</sup>. A tous deux, l'ange de YHWH est apparu (Ex 3,2; Jg 6,12: *wayyērā' mal'ak yhwh*)<sup>(36)</sup>. Le texte de l'Exode reprendra plus d'une fois ce thème<sup>(37)</sup>. Ex 3,16 montre que la mission de Moïse se fonde sur sa vision. Le message divin que Moïse doit transmettre aux anciens commence par ces mots: «YHWH, le Dieu de vos pères, m'est apparu...» (*nir'ā*). Les doutes de Moïse portent aussi sur ce

---

*der Propheten* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1975): «Sachlich hat der Einsetzungsbericht die Aufgabe der Legitimation des in der Biographie Dargestellten in seiner öffentlichen Funktion» (23). Pour d'autres détails sur les récits de vocations, voir aussi W. VOGELS, «Les récits de vocation des prophètes», *NRT* 95 (1973) 3-24, surtout 11 (vocation du «serviteur confident plénipotentiaire», comme Moïse et Gédéon) et 13-16 (vocation de «conseiller», Is 6 et 1 R 22,19-22).

<sup>(32)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 108-113, 148.

<sup>(33)</sup> W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel 1-24* (BK XIII,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 18-21; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 1-12* (BK X,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 236.

<sup>(34)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 110-111.

<sup>(35)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 29-38 (Gédéon); 38-44 (Moïse).

<sup>(36)</sup> Pour une analyse récente du récit de vocation (Jg 6,12-17.24), voir U. BECKER, *Richterzeit und Königtum*. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch (BZAW 192; Berlin – New York 1990) 145-151 (avec bibliographie).

<sup>(37)</sup> Ces textes n'appartiennent sans doute pas à la même source. Notre but est seulement d'analyser les développements du thème dans la tradition. Pour l'analyse du texte, voir entre autres W.H. SCHMIDT, *Exodus 1-6* (BK I,2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1988) 100-207.

fait; selon lui, les Israélites diront: «YHWH ne t'est pas apparu» (*lô' nir'à 'ēlēka yhwh*; 4,1). Sans vision, il n'y a pas de mission possible<sup>(38)</sup>. En ce qui concerne Gédéon, K. Baltzer a relevé les trois principaux éléments qui justifient sa vocation et le lavent du soupçon d'être un ambitieux ou l'instrument d'une puissante famille (cf. Jg 6,15): c'est Dieu lui-même qui lui confie une mission (6,14); Gédéon peut parler à la divinité et donc il devient un «serviteur de Dieu», assuré de l'assistance divine (6,16a); il a pu voir l'ange de YHWH face à face sans mourir (6,22-23)<sup>(39)</sup>. Le troisième élément est celui qui nous intéresse davantage.

Un ultime exemple confirmera le rôle essentiel que joue la vision dans la vie des prophètes. Il provient du cycle d'Élie et d'Élisée. Lorsqu'Élie est près d'être emporté au ciel, il demande à son disciple Élisée ce qu'il veut recevoir. Ce dernier demande deux-tiers de l'esprit de son maître (2 R 2,9). Déjà H. Grotius avait rapproché ce texte de Dt 21,17, où il est dit que l'aîné a droit aux deux-tiers de l'héritage familial<sup>(40)</sup>. Élisée demande donc de pouvoir hériter de l'esprit prophétique de son maître et de devenir ainsi son légitime successeur. Élie met une condition à ce legs: il faut que son disciple le voie lorsqu'il sera emporté au ciel (2 R 2,10). S'il est capable de percevoir ce phénomène céleste, cela signifie qu'il a accès à un monde interdit au commun des mortels<sup>(41)</sup> et qu'il est le digne héritier d'Élie<sup>(42)</sup>.

#### b. Le conseil divin

D'autres textes confirment cette vue. Ils parlent explicitement d'un «conseil» (*sôd*; Am 3,7; Jr 23,18.22)<sup>(43)</sup>. Le vrai prophète est

<sup>(38)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 40.

<sup>(39)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 37-38.

<sup>(40)</sup> Cité par J. A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1960) 354.

<sup>(41)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 101. Cf. 2 R 6,17 où Élisée demande à Dieu de faire voir à un serviteur l'armée invisible qui entoure le prophète.

<sup>(42)</sup> C'est l'opinion commune des exégètes: voir, entre autres, H. GUNKEL, *Jahve und Baal* (Die Religion des Alten Testaments 2; Tübingen 1911) 32; J. GRAY, *1 & 2 Kings. A Commentary* (OTL; London – Philadelphia 1970) 475; T. R. HOBBS, *2 Kings* (WBC 13; Waco 1985) 21. La «vision» est caractéristique d'un personnage prophétique comme Balaam; voir Nb 22,31; 24,4.16.

<sup>(43)</sup> Voir entre autres E. T. MULLEN, *The Assembly of the Gods. The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* (HSM 24; Chico 1980) 217-220.

celui qui « voit » et « entend » ce qui se passe à la cour céleste: « Car qui a assisté (*ʾāmad*) au conseil de YHWH? Qu'il voie (*wēyēreh*) et qu'il entende sa parole! »; Jr 23,18a)<sup>(44)</sup>. Dans ce dernier texte de Jérémie, la vision n'est pas un fait isolé. Le prophète est invité à « voir » et « entendre » continuellement ce qui se passe au conseil divin. Cet élément se retrouve ailleurs chez Jérémie comme dans les traditions d'Élie et d'Élisée.

Ces traditions sur Élie et Élisée ont conservé une expression qui les décrit comme des membres permanents du conseil divin: ils « se tiennent en présence de YHWH ». Le verbe *ʾmd* (« se tenir debout ») est celui qui apparaît chez Jérémie (23,18; cf. *supra*). Élie parle au nom du « Seigneur d'Israël en face de qui je me tiens » (*yhw h'ēlōhē yisrā'ēl 'āšer 'āmadî l'pānāyw*) (1 R 17, 1; 18,15). Le privilège de pouvoir « se tenir en face de YHWH » est le sceau qui authentifie ses paroles<sup>(45)</sup>. La même expression se retrouve deux fois sur les lèvres d'Élisée (2 R 3,14; 5,16)<sup>(46)</sup>. Jr 15,19 (« si tu reviens... tu te tiendras devant moi [YHWH] ») et 18,20 (« rappelle-toi [YHWH] comme je me suis tenu devant toi ») emploient le même verbe, tout comme 1 R 22,19 à propos de l'armée des cieux qui constitue la cour céleste et le conseil divin dans la vision de Michée ben Yimlah. Le verbe *ʾmd lipnē* (« se tenir en présence de », « être au service de ») est donc employé pour les êtres divins et pour le prophète<sup>(47)</sup>. Dans le monde profane, l'expression signifie « être au service de », ce qui équivaut, dans le plupart des occurrences, au fait d'occuper une fonction officielle. C'est le cas de Joseph est au service de Pharaon (Gn 41,46), de Josué au service de Moïse (Dt 1,38), de David au service de Saül (1 S 16,21-22), d'Abishag au service de David (1 R 1,2), des serviteurs de Salomon (1 R 10,8), de Nebouzaradân, le général de Nabuchodonosor (Jr 52,12), de Daniel et ses compagnons à la cour du même roi (Dn 1,5)<sup>(48)</sup>.

La même idée peut être exprimée par le verbe *yšb/nšb* (« se tenir debout [en présence de] »). Il est employé, toujours pour les

<sup>(44)</sup> Nous traduisons le TM. Pour une discussion du texte, voir W.L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1986) 633.

<sup>(45)</sup> H. RINGGREN, « *ʾāmad* », *TWAT* VI, 194-204, sp. 198-199.

<sup>(46)</sup> 2 R 3,14 ajoute *šēbā'ôt* à *yhw h'*.

<sup>(47)</sup> RINGGREN, « *ʾāmad* », 199.

<sup>(48)</sup> RINGGREN, « *ʾāmad* », 198-199.

membres d'un conseil, en Job 1,6; 2,1; Prov 22,29; Za 6,5<sup>(49)</sup>. En Dt 10,8; Jg 20,28; 1 R 8,11; Ez 44,15, l'expression désigne le service sacerdotal.

### c. Voir le roi

Pour étayer ces conclusions à propos du rôle de la vision, il convient, en dernier lieu, d'invoquer une série de textes qui proviennent du monde profane, et plus particulièrement de celui de la cour royale. Là aussi, le fait de «voir» correspond à un statut spécial. En effet, l'expression «voir la face du roi», qui signifie en général «être reçu en audience», est une faveur accordée à des privilégiés. Le fait de «voir le roi» peut, comme la *visio Dei*, comporter des dangers (1 R 18,1-2.15: Élie et Achab). C'est surtout le cas dans un texte tardif comme Est 4,11 (cf. 5,1-2). Quelques textes soulignent la solennité de la «vision» qui s'accompagne d'un certain rituel (1 S 25,23; 2 S 24,20). Il est possible d'imposer certaines conditions à qui veut être reçu, comme le montre l'histoire de Joseph (Gn 43,3.5; 44,23.26) ou celle de David et Abner (2 S 3,13). Qui est en disgrâce ne peut plus «voir la face» du roi, à l'instar de Moïse chassé par Pharaon (Ex 10,28-29) ou d'Absalom tenu à l'écart par David (2 S 14,24.28.32). Les officiels de la cour sont ceux «qui voient la face du roi» (*rō'ê p'enē-hammelek*: 2 R 25,19 = Jr 52,25; Est 1,14)<sup>(50)</sup>. En ce qui concerne l'exégèse de Ex 24,11, retenons surtout le fait que «voir» le roi ne va pas de soi, que c'est un événement qui comporte certains risques, que «voir» ou «ne pas voir» équivaut à être en grâce ou en disgrâce et que l'expression «ceux qui voient la face du roi» désigne l'entourage immédiat du souverain, ses ministres et les grands de la cour. Il n'est pas nécessaire de souligner davantage le parallélisme entre ces textes et Ex 24,11.

### Conclusion: la vision de Ex 24,11

Tous ces textes montrent à l'évidence que dans la tradition prophétique la vision inaugurale est le moment où Dieu fait de celui qu'il a choisi son envoyé officiel. La vision lui fournit ses lettres de créances. Les similitudes avec Ex 24,11 sont frappantes et invitent à

<sup>(49)</sup> J. REINDL, «*nšb/yšb*», *TWAT* V, 555-565, sp. 561.

<sup>(50)</sup> H.F. FUHS, «*rā'āh*», *TWAT* VII, 225-266, sp. 244; H. SIMIAN-YOFRE, «*pānim*», *TWAT* VI, 629-659, sp. 647.



interpréter ce dernier texte dans le même sens. Les notables d'Israël bénéficient d'une vision à laquelle ils survivent, ils sont admis en présence de Dieu dans sa résidence céleste et peuvent donc désormais faire partie d'un « conseil divin ». Cette scène a pour but d'établir leur autorité et de légitimer leur fonction au service de Dieu. Certes, ils ne sont pas « envoyés » comme les prophètes et la scène n'est pas un récit de vocation. Leur mandat est différent et il faudrait étudier d'autres textes pour préciser les droits et les devoirs de ces « notables »<sup>(51)</sup>. Les énoncés provenant du milieu royal corroborent ces observations, car la « vision » du roi y correspond aussi à un statut spécial.

## 2. *Le repas*

Si la vision a pour but de fonder l'autorité des notables, qu'en est-il du repas? Si les repas en présence de Dieu ne sont pas très fréquents, la Bible parle plus souvent de repas « en présence du roi ». Il s'agit en général d'une faveur exceptionnelle réservée aux grands officiels de la cour et à certains privilégiés. Comme dans le cas de la *visio Dei*, cette faveur investit d'une dignité particulière ceux qui en bénéficient. C'est ce que nous voudrions montrer à présent.

Deux syntagmes méritent de retenir l'attention. Le premier, « manger à la table du roi » (*'kl [ʿal]-šulḥan-hammelek*) signifie que le roi pourvoit personnellement à l'entretien d'un personnage ou d'un groupe particulier. Il peut s'agir d'une façon de récompenser la fidélité ou la générosité de quelqu'un. C'est le cas de Barzillai à qui David offre cette possibilité. Il la refuse, mais elle est étendue à ses fils (1 R 2,7; cf. 2 S 19,34). David avait gratifié Méphiboshet, le fils de Jonathan, de cette faveur. Mais dans ce cas, l'intention de David était sans doute, par ce biais, de garder à vue un éventuel rival (2 S 9,7.10.11.13). 2 S 9,11 permet de préciser la portée du geste: Méphiboshet sera traité « comme l'un des fils de roi ». « Manger à la table du roi » est synonyme de « faire partie de la famille royale ».

<sup>(51)</sup> Voir, par exemple, BLUM, *Studien*, 339-345 (avec bibliographie) sur les institutions postexiliques. Le sacerdoce et les anciens étaient, selon lui, les deux institutions de la communauté postexilique qui avaient pu survivre à la catastrophe et se considéraient comme les véritables héritières de Moïse et donc marquées du sceau de l'autorité divine. Pour le sacerdoce et Moïse, voir Ex 29 et Lv 8: Aaron et ses fils sont consacrés *par Moïse*. Pour les anciens, voir Nb 11,16-17.24-30: les soixante-dix anciens reçoivent l'esprit *de Moïse*.

C'est ainsi que David partageait la table de Saül avec Jonathan (1 S 20,29; cf. vv. 25-34) et que chacune de ses absences était remarquée. Il était, lui aussi, un hôte de choix sous haute surveillance. Les prophètes de Baal et d'Astarté sont les commensaux de la reine Jézabel (1 R 18,19), alors que Dieu se charge de nourrir le prophète Élie par l'intermédiaire de corbeaux (17,4) ou de la veuve de Sarepta (17,9). Enfin, après la fin de la monarchie, Néhémie parle des cent cinquante Juifs et notables qui sont reçus à sa table et qui sont donc à sa charge, non à celle du peuple (Ne 5,17). On peut rapprocher de ces exemples le texte de Esd 4,14 où les officiels de la cour de Perse se décrivent eux-mêmes comme «ceux qui mangent le sel du palais». Ces exemples montrent que la formule «manger à la table du roi» signifie au moins deux choses: être à la charge du roi et faire partie de sa famille au sens large<sup>(52)</sup>. Il s'agit d'un statut permanent, non d'une faveur ponctuelle. Rien ne permet de penser que le repas de Ex 24,11 soit de cet ordre. Ni le vocabulaire, ni le contexte ne vont dans ce sens.

L'autre expression est plus rare, mais sans doute plus proche du passage que nous étudions<sup>(53)</sup>. Dans trois textes apparaît la formule «manger en face du roi» (*'kl lipnê hammelek*)<sup>(54)</sup>. David réserve cet honneur à Urie dans les circonstances dramatiques du récit bien connu de 2 S 11,13. Lorsque le roi de Babylone, Ewil-Mérodak, décide de grâcier Yoyakîn, il lui accorde entre autres de «manger en face de lui tous les jours de sa vie» (2 R 25,29 = Jr 52,33). Enfin, le roi Assuérus organise au début du livre d'Esther un grand festin pour tous les dignitaires de son empire «en face de lui» (Est 1,3).

La faveur peut être occasionnelle, par exemple en ce qui concerne Urie ou les grands officiers de l'empire de Perse. Elle est permanente dans le cas de Yoyakîn, mais le texte le précise explicitement («tous les jours de sa vie»; 2 R 25,29-30 = Jr 52,33-34). Le livre d'Esther permet d'ajouter un autre élément. Le festin offert par Assuérus à ses dignitaires se distingue de celui qu'il

<sup>(52)</sup> D. DE VAUX, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament I* (Paris 1961) 187; VRIEZEN, «Exegesis», 113.

<sup>(53)</sup> La similitude a été notée par VRIEZEN, «Exegesis», 113; SMEND, «Essen», 141-142; RENAUD, *Théophanie*, 178, 180. Mais Vriezen et Smend parlent ensuite de repas d'alliance et Renaud de repas cultuel.

<sup>(54)</sup> Pour les parallèles mésopotamiens, voir VRIEZEN, «Exegesis», 112, n. 2: manger *ina pâni šarri* («en face du roi»).

offre aux habitants de Suse (Est 1,5) et de celui qui est organisé par la reine (1,9). Seuls les dignitaires festoient « en présence du roi » (1,3). Il faut en conclure que pouvoir « manger en présence du roi » est un honneur réservé occasionnellement à la classe dirigeante d'un royaume ou à des individus, dans des circonstances exceptionnelles.

En conclusion, « manger en présence du roi » est un événement peu ordinaire et le privilège en est réservé aux plus hauts notables du royaume. Plusieurs de ces éléments se retrouvent en Ex 24,11, puisqu'il n'y a qu'un seul repas et que ceux qui y participent forment l'« élite des Israélites » (*'āšîlê b'enê yiśrā'ēl*)<sup>(55)</sup>.

### 3. *Le repas et la vision*

Il a semblé opportun de traiter des deux thèmes séparément. A présent, il convient de montrer que l'interprétation de Ex 24,11 dépend de leur corrélation.

Malheureusement, il n'existe à notre connaissance aucun parallèle vétérotestamentaire qui contienne les deux éléments, vision et repas<sup>(56)</sup>. Il faut donc renoncer à cet éclairage. Cependant, les analyses précédentes ont montré deux choses. D'abord que la vision et le repas sont tous deux des privilèges accordés dans de rares occasions. La vision coïncide, dans les textes analysés, avec le début de la mission prophétique ou avec son exercice. Celui qui « voit Dieu » fait en général partie du conseil divin (1 R 22,19; Jr 23,18). D'autre part, le repas est un honneur qui revient à ceux que le roi veut favoriser de façon particulière (Urie et Yoyakîn; 2 S 11,13; 2 R 25,29) ou qui appartiennent au cercle étroit de ses plus proches collaborateurs (les grands de l'empire perse; Est 1,3). Ex 24 entre parfaitement dans ce cadre. Les notables peuvent « voir » Dieu sans subir aucun dommage. Ils sont donc admis parmi ses familiers. Le repas ne fait que confirmer ce fait. Si les nuances culturelles sont absentes, c'est parce qu'un aspect différent prédomine: il s'agit d'une scène d'investiture qui inaugure et légitime la fonction des notables

<sup>(55)</sup> Quelle que soit l'étymologie et le sens exact du terme, il désigne un groupe restreint qui occupe une position particulière au sein du peuple. Pour plus de détails, voir VRIEZEN, « Exegesis », 102; NICHOLSON, « Interpretation », 83.

<sup>(56)</sup> Dans le Nouveau Testament, voir Actes 1,3-4; 10,40-41; cf. Jn 21,1.13-14; Luc 24,36-43.

au sein du peuple d'Israël<sup>(57)</sup>. Si le texte ne contient aucune allusion incontestable à l'alliance, c'est parce que celle-ci est conclue entre Dieu et tout le peuple, non entre Dieu et les seuls représentants de ce peuple. Il n'est pas question d'établir un lien juridique et public entre Dieu et les notables, mais de fonder et d'authentifier la position de ceux-ci vis-à-vis du peuple. Pour ce faire, Ex 24,9-11 a employé un langage propre à la tradition prophétique, celui de la *visio Dei*, et l'a conjugué avec un thème provenant des traditions royales (le repas « en face du roi »). Les deux éléments avaient en commun de toucher à la question de l'appartenance au « conseil divin ». Mais quand et pourquoi s'est-on posé cette question? Ceci nous oblige à aborder à présent le problème de la datation de Ex 24,9-11.

### III. Date et milieu d'origine de Ex 24,9-11

Nombre d'exégètes considèrent aujourd'hui que Ex 24,9-11 est d'origine postexilique. Les arguments les plus convaincants ont été fournis par E. Ruprecht<sup>(58)</sup>. Il commence son étude par une réflexion d'ordre méthodologique: si le texte est ancien, comment la tradition a-t-elle pu le conserver alors que certains de ses éléments, comme la vision accordée à un groupe important, est en flagrante contradiction avec les théologies plus récentes comme celle du Deutéronome (Dt 4,12.15; 5,23-27) ou de l'écrivain sacerdotal (Ex 24,15-18; Nb 17,5)? Ensuite, plus concrètement, il s'appuie sur la présence des anciens, le vocabulaire et l'arrière-fond culturel de Ex 24,9-11. La présence des anciens n'oblige pas à penser que le texte doit remonter à l'époque prémonarchique, car cette institution est attestée tout au long de l'histoire d'Israël, jusqu'à l'époque postexilique; Is 24,23 provient indiscutablement de cette dernière période<sup>(59)</sup>. Le vocabulaire contient deux éléments qui rapprochent notre passage d'Ézéchiel. Le premier est la comparaison sans *tertium*

(57) « So hat der Bericht eine deutlich initiierende Kraft und Absicht », PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 186.

(58) RUPRECHT, « Ex 24,9-11 », 142-143. Pour une datation plus ancienne, voir PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 189; E. W. NICHOLSON, « The Antiquity of the Tradition in Exodus xxiv 9-11 », *VT* 25 (1975) 67-79; MCCARTHY, *Treaty*, 265 (bibliographie n. 42).

(59) Sur les anciens, voir J. BUCHHOLZ, *Die Ältesten Israels im Buch Deuteronomium* (GTA 36; Göttingen 1988); H. REVIV, *The Elders in Ancient Israel. A Study of a Biblical Institution* (Jerusalem 1989). Sur Is 24,23 voir T. M. WILLIS, « Yahweh's Elders (Isa 24,23): Senior Officials of the Divine Court », *ZAW* 103 (1991) 375-385.

*paragonis, k<sup>e</sup>ma'āšeh libnat hassappîr* («comme un ouvrage de carreaux de lazulite»; Ex 24,10b). Les textes les plus voisins proviennent des visions de Ez 1,26-27; 8,2; 10,1. Le second est le syntagme *libnat hassappîr* («carreaux de lazulite»). La lazulite est mentionnée par Ex 28,18; 39,11; Is 54,11; Ez 1,26; 10,1; 28,13; Job 28,6.16; Lam 4,7; Ct 5,14, tous textes tardifs. Ex 24,10 est plus proche des visions d'Ézéchiel, parce que la majesté du moment est moins liée au cérémonial, comme dans Is 6, qu'aux matériaux entrevus. Quant à l'arrière-fond culturel, il faut le chercher dans la description des temples mésopotamiens qu'Israël a pu connaître durant l'exil. Selon nous, l'argument décisif est celui du vocabulaire. A cela, il est possible d'ajouter qu'il serait difficile d'imaginer qu'un tel texte ait pu voir le jour au moment où l'institution prophétique était en pleine vigueur et que la *visio Dei* était leur apanage exclusif. Après l'exil, il n'en sera plus de même et très probablement Israël s'est interrogé pour savoir qui pourrait prendre le relai des «voyants».

Versons encore trois pièces à ce dossier, même si elles ne sont pas décisives. Le mot *tōhar* («pureté»; Ex 24,10) est rare et ses emplois sont plutôt tardifs (Ps 89,45; Lv 12,4.6). Le texte du Ps 89,45 est difficile et sa date discutée<sup>(60)</sup>. De même, deux textes qui usent en parallèle les deux verbes «voir» (*r'h* et *hzh*; Ex 24,10.11) pour décrire une vision de Dieu sont tardifs (Job 19,26-27; 23,9)<sup>(61)</sup>. Enfin, l'usage de *'ešem* («os») dans le sens de «même» (Ex 24,10) est typique de nombreux textes récents, surtout du milieu sacerdotal et d'Ézéchiel (Gn 7,13; 17,23.26; 12,17.41.51; Lv 23,14.21.28-30; Ez 2,3; 24,2; 40,1)<sup>(62)</sup>. Ces éléments ne fournissent sans doute pas de preuve définitive, mais ils apportent de l'eau au moulin de ceux qui préfèrent une date récente<sup>(63)</sup>.

En fin de compte, le texte se situe au confluent de plusieurs traditions: le monde prophétique, avec le vocabulaire de la vision et le concept de «conseil divin», un style marqué au coin par le langage

<sup>(60)</sup> M. E. TATE, *Psalms 51-100* (WBC 20; Dallas, TX 1990) 414-417, après une longue discussion penche pour une date exilique ou postexilique. Pour la traduction, voir p. 412.

<sup>(61)</sup> Pour le Ps 63, très difficile à dater, voir les commentaires. Pour d'autres textes qui ne parlent pas de *visio Dei*, mais qui emploient les deux verbes *r'h* et *hzh*, voir Nb 24,16-17; Is 30,10; 33,17.20; Prov 24,32.

<sup>(62)</sup> Autres textes: Dt 32,48; Jos 5,11; 10,27.

<sup>(63)</sup> H. H. SCHMID, *Der sogenannte Jahwist*. Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung (Zürich 1976) 110-112; BUCHHOLZ, *Die Ältesten*, 33-38, plaident aussi pour une date tardive.

du monde sacerdotal, l'idée d'un repas «en présence de Dieu» ou «en présence du souverain», provenant des us et coutumes des cours orientales, et, il faut l'ajouter, la présence des anciens, une institution qui a des accointances avec le monde deutéronomique et deutéronomiste<sup>(64)</sup>. Tout ceci plaide, bien sûr, en faveur d'une date tardive.

Les arguments en faveur d'une date plus ancienne sont beaucoup plus vagues, car il font rarement appel à la facture du texte, mais plus souvent à l'atmosphère ou au ton général du passage<sup>(65)</sup>. Il est vrai que la description de Ex 24,9-11 diffère par sa simplicité des autres descriptions de la théophanie du Sinaï<sup>(66)</sup> tout comme des visions prophétiques<sup>(67)</sup>. Mais la simplicité n'est pas nécessairement une marque d'antiquité. Les additions les plus récentes du Pentateuque sont la plupart du temps le résultat d'interventions ponctuelles. Certains textes postexiliques ont plusieurs points communs avec Ex 24,9-11, comme le montrera la suite de cette étude. Si nous ne retrouvons pas ici la théologie du «nom» propre au Deutéronome ou celle de la «gloire»<sup>(68)</sup>, typique du sacerdotal, cela n'oblige pas non plus à choisir une date antique. La rédaction tardive du Pentateuque ne se limite pas nécessairement aux textes d'origine deutéronomiste et sacerdotale. On a pu arguer que Moïse était absent à l'origine de la tradition de Ex 24,9-11<sup>(69)</sup>. Cet argument ne vaut, bien sûr, que

(64) BUCHHOLZ, *Die Ältesten*, 33-38, pour qui Ex 24,1,9-11 veut réhabiliter les «anciens» accusés par Ézéchiél de ne plus être aptes au culte (Ez 8,7-12 et Ex 24,11a); K.J. HOPPE, «Elders and Deuteronomy: A Proposal», *ÉglT* 14 (1983) 259-272; id., *The Origins of Deuteronomy* (University Microfilms International; Ann Arbor – London 1978-1980); id., «The Meaning of Deuteronomy», *BTB* 10 (1980) 111-117.

(65) H. Greßmann pensait trouver dans ce texte la première pierre de la tradition du Sinaï (*Mose*, 182).

(66) NICHOLSON, «Antiquity», 75-76.

(67) MCCARTHY, *Treaty*, 265.

(68) MCCARTHY, *Treaty*, 265. Il parle aussi de la simplicité du texte qui rappelle Gn 2 et ses joyaux (Gn 2,12). Mais cet élément fait davantage penser à Ez 1,28; Is 54,11 (voir *supra*).

(69) NICHOLSON, «Antiquity», 76-79. Moïse ne joue aucun rôle particulier dans cette scène et c'est ce qui rend sa présence suspecte. Il faut cependant observer que les verbes *ālēh* (24,1) e *wayya'al* (24,9) sont au singulier et que Moïse en est le sujet. Moïse est donc bien ancré dans cette partie du texte (RENAUD, *Théophanie*, 32). On a aussi émis des doutes sur l'originalité de la mention d'Aaron, Nadab et Abi parce qu'ils sont inactifs durant la scène (A.H.J. GUNNEWEG, *Leviten und Priester*. Hauptlinien der Traditionsbildung und Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Kultpersonals

pour la tradition ancienne, et non pour le texte actuel qui fait l'objet de notre examen<sup>(70)</sup>. La présence, côte à côte, de Moïse, d'Aaron, Nadab et Abiu, et des anciens fait songer à la période postexilique quand sacerdote et anciens comblaient le vide laissé par la monarchie. Quelques textes tardifs vont confirmer le fait que les anciens et/ou le grand-prêtre font partie du conseil divin aux yeux de la communauté postexilique, à l'exclusion d'autres prétendants à cet honneur.

### 1. *L'absence du roi dans le conseil divin – Jr 30,21*

Ce passage de Jérémie traite du roi futur: «Son prince sera l'un d'entre eux et son chef sortira de son sein; je le ferai s'approcher et il s'avancera vers moi; car qui donc mettrait son coeur en gage pour s'avancer vers moi, oracle de YHWH?» Le texte évite le nom de «roi» (*melek*) et préfère les appellations plus neutres *'addîr* («noble», «prince») et *môšēl* («gouvernant», «chef», «souverain»). L'oracle insiste sur deux points. D'abord, le futur souverain sera un membre du peuple d'Israël et non plus un étranger. Ensuite, il aura accès à Dieu. En d'autres termes, il sera agréé par YHWH dans ses nouvelles fonctions. La problématique qui se fait jour ici est liée à la fin de la monarchie. L'échec de cette institution est flagrant. C'est pourquoi, dans le futur, il sera important que le roi soit agréable à Dieu. Le vocabulaire, cependant, est cultuel. Le verbe *qrb* («s'approcher») n'est employé au *hif.* que dans quelques textes qui parlent des prêtres (Nb 16,5.10) ou du roi Akhaz dans l'exercice de fonc-

---

[Göttingen 1965] 86; PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 183; MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium*, 153; F. L. HOFELD, *Der Dekalog: seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen* [OBO 45; Freiburg Schweiz – Göttingen 1982] 201; BUCHHOLZ, *Die Ältesten*, 34; BLUM, *Studien*, 89-90, n. 96, e. a.). Tout cela est bien possible, mais l'argument vaut aussi pour les anciens. C'est pourquoi nous préférons nous en tenir au texte dans sa teneur actuelle, même s'il peut porter la marque d'interventions rédactionnelles.

<sup>(70)</sup> E. ZENGER, *Die Sinaitheophanie. Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk* (FzB 3; Würzburg 1971) 164, voit dans Ex 24,9-11 l'œuvre du Jéhoviste. Il aurait écrit sous Ézéchias et son but était de soutenir la réforme de ce roi. Il est difficile de voir comment cette «vision» des notables d'Israël peut remplir une telle fonction. Où sont le roi et le temple? Voir la critique de E. W. NICHOLSON, «The Origin of the Tradition in Exodus xxiv 9-11», *VT* 26 (1976) 148-160, sp. 152-153.

tions cultuelles (2 R 16,12)<sup>(71)</sup>. Le texte est important pour notre sujet, car il cherche à résoudre le problème en insistant sur le fait que le roi pourra être un intime de Dieu. Il insiste aussi sur le fait que s'approcher de Dieu est en soi impossible. Mais il reste en dehors des traditions sur le « conseil divin » pour utiliser le vocabulaire du culte. D'autre part, aucun texte postexilique ne signalera la présence du roi ou du messie futur dans le conseil divin. Ceci correspond au déclin de la royauté à cette époque et explique à suffisance pourquoi Ex 24,1.9-11 ne contient aucune allusion à cette institution.

## 2. *Les anciens* – Is 24,23

Ce texte est plus proche de Ex 24,9-11 parce qu'il parle des anciens: « La lune sera confuse, le soleil sera couvert de honte, car YHWH des armées règne sur le mont Sion à Jérusalem et sa gloire [apparaît] devant ses anciens ». Les rapports entre les deux passages ont déjà été étudiés<sup>(72)</sup>. En général, on estime que Is 24,23 dépend de Ex 24,9-11<sup>(73)</sup>. La raison alléguée est que le texte mentionne en même temps les anciens et la gloire. Il combine ainsi deux traditions, celle de la vision sur la montagne (Ex 24,9-11) et celle de la gloire du récit sacerdotal (voir par exemple Ex 24,16-17). Il doit donc leur être postérieur<sup>(74)</sup>.

Un élément surprend dans ce passage. Pourquoi seuls les anciens sont-ils présents sur la montagne? Ni roi, ni prêtre, ni prophète n'apparaissent dans ce texte. Les seuls représentants d'Israël reçus en présence de YHWH sur la montagne de Sion sont les anciens. La gloire est « devant eux » (*neged zeqēnāyw kābôd*). Cette gloire était apparue sur le mont Sinaï, aux yeux de tout Israël (Ex 24,17). Elle avait ensuite pris possession de la tente au désert (Ex 40,34-35), puis du temple de Salomon (1 R 8,11). Elle avait quitté ce temple et le pays d'Israël, selon Ez 10,4.18.19; 11,22-23, mais elle est revenue ensuite habiter sur le mont Sion (Ez 43,2-4; 44,4). Toutefois la gloire, typique des textes sacerdotaux, se trouve non pas, comme on pour-

(71) W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52* (Minneapolis 1989) 179.

(72) WELTEN, « Vernichtung », 129-146 (voir n. 12).

(73) J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*. Isaïe, I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël I (EB; Paris 1977) 360-361; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja 13-27* (BK X,2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 949-950.

(74) Voir entre autres WELTEN, « Vernichtung », 136.



rait s'y attendre, devant les membres du sacerdoce, ni dans le temple, mais devant les anciens. Faut-il dire que la gloire est réservée aux anciens, à l'exclusion de tout autre groupe, ou simplement qu'elle est présente d'abord et surtout pour les anciens? Les silences du texte sont difficiles à interpréter. A tout le moins, il faut dire que Is 24,23 leur accorde la place d'honneur en éclipsant tous les autres candidats à ce privilège. Ce texte cherche certainement à fonder leur autorité et leur supériorité en recourant au vocabulaire de la gloire.

### 3. *Le grand-prêtre – Za 3,7*

Ici, au contraire, c'est Josué, le grand-prêtre, qui est admis en présence de Dieu. Le récit veut légitimer la position particulière de Josué en le faisant entrer dans le conseil divin<sup>(75)</sup>: «Ainsi a parlé YHWH des armées: 'Si tu marches dans mes chemins et si tu observes mes directives, c'est toi qui gouverneras ma maison et c'est toi qui garderas mes parvis; je t'accorderai de venir prendre place parmi ceux qui se tiennent ici'»<sup>(76)</sup>. Le verbe *'md* («se tenir debout») désigne ici comme dans d'autres textes analysés plus haut les membres du conseil divin<sup>(77)</sup>. Mais quel rôle va jouer le grand-prêtre au sein de cette assemblée? Pour d'aucuns, il participera à la liturgie céleste, bien que le texte n'y fasse guère allusion<sup>(78)</sup>. D'autres ont parlé d'intercession<sup>(79)</sup>. Ici encore, le récit de la vision reste muet à ce sujet. Enfin, le texte, pour un troisième groupe, mettrait en relief le fait que le grand-prêtre n'a pas seulement accès au Saint des Saints, mais à l'intimité divine dans le ciel<sup>(80)</sup>. Mais on attendrait un vocabulaire plus cultuel, avec les verbes *qrb* ou *ngš* («s'approcher») et quelques éléments liturgiques pour décrire le cadre de la scène.

Il semble plus raisonnable de penser que le texte décrit l'investiture de Josué dans ces fonctions de responsable du temple, ce qui est mentionné explicitement dans le même verset: «tu gouverneras

<sup>(75)</sup> BALTZER, *Biographie*, 179.

<sup>(76)</sup> Pour la traduction, voir entre autres D.L. PETERSEN, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* (OTL; London – Philadelphia 1984) 206-207.

<sup>(77)</sup> Voir *supra*, p. 315.

<sup>(78)</sup> S. AMSLER, *Aggée - Zacharie 1-8* (CAT XIc; Neuchâtel – Paris 1981) 81-82.

<sup>(79)</sup> W. NOWACK, *Die kleinen Propheten* (HKAT III,4; Göttingen 1903) 355; F. HORST, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Nahum bis Malachi* (HBAT 14; Tübingen 1964) 228.

<sup>(80)</sup> T. CHARY, *Aggée, Zacharie, Malachie* (SB; Paris 1969) 76-77.

(*tādīn*) ma maison et tu veilleras sur mes parvis» (3,7aß)<sup>(81)</sup>. Cette responsabilité s'étend au temple plutôt qu'à toute la maison de Juda. Le parallélisme entre *bêti* («ma maison») et *ḥāṣērāy* («mes parvis») favorise cette interprétation du mot «maison»<sup>(82)</sup>. Il existait une instance juridique au temple, selon Dt 17,9 et Ez 44,24<sup>(83)</sup>. Mais Za 3,7 donne au grand-prêtre une place exceptionnelle en lui accordant le monopole de l'administration du temple, à l'exclusion du roi, et en le faisant accéder au conseil divin<sup>(84)</sup>. En effet, le roi pouvait intervenir dans les affaires du temple, comme en témoignent certains textes des livres des Rois<sup>(85)</sup>. En outre, l'accès au conseil divin donne au grand-prêtre une autorité analogue à celle des prophètes<sup>(86)</sup>. La vision décrit en fin de compte l'investiture du grand-prêtre comme administrateur et fonde sa nouvelle autorité<sup>(87)</sup>. Cependant, il faut noter que le privilège est lié à l'observance des normes édictées au v. 7a: «Si tu marches sur mes chemins, si tu observes mes directives...» et que le grand-prêtre doit d'abord être purifié (3,4-5).

### Conclusion

Ces quelques textes tardifs montrent que durant la période postexilique la question s'est posée de savoir qui pourrait faire partie du «conseil divin». En réalité, seuls les anciens et le grand-prêtre sont mentionnés. Tout comme en Ex 24,1.9-11. Ceci nous permet de conclure en disant que les indices relevés au cours de notre enquête sur le texte lui-même comme sur la tradition postérieure favorisent

<sup>(81)</sup> C. L. MEYERS-E. M. MEYERS, *Haggai - Zechariah 1-8* (AB 25B; Garden City, NY 1987) 178 et 197: «the priest must execute justice and thus needs to have access to divine will».

<sup>(82)</sup> PETERSEN, *Zechariah*, 205.

<sup>(83)</sup> PETERSEN, *ibid.*

<sup>(84)</sup> C. JEREMIAS, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharjah*. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung im Zusammenhang der Visionsberichte im Alten Testament und ihrem Bildmaterial (FRLANT 117; Göttingen 1977) 216.

<sup>(85)</sup> 1 R 2,26-27: Salomon démet Abiatar de ses fonctions de prêtre; 1 R 8,5.62-66: Salomon offre des sacrifices et consacre le temple (8,64); 2 R 16,10-18: le roi Akhaz modifie la disposition du temple et offre des sacrifices; 2 R 12,5-17: le roi Joas fait réparer le temple; 2 R 22,3-7: le roi Josias fait de même.

<sup>(86)</sup> JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 218; PETERSEN, *Zechariah*, 208.

<sup>(87)</sup> E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch* (KAT 12; Leipzig 1922) 448; HORST, *Die zwölf Propheten*, 228, parle de «Investiturstakt», qui confère à Josué une «geistliche Rechtsstellung».

l'interprétation proposée au sujet du repas de Ex 24,11: sa première fonction est de légitimer comme membres du conseil divin les dignes héritiers de Moïse après la catastrophe de l'exil, en l'occurrence les membres de la classe sacerdotale d'Aaron et les représentants des anciens. Mais si Ex 24,1.9-11 cite ensemble le groupe des soixante-dix anciens et l'ancêtre de la classe sacerdotale, Aaron, avec deux de ses fils, Is 24,23 ne parle que des anciens et Za 3,7 que du grand-prêtre Josué. L'apocalypse d'Isaïe situe la scène sur le mont Sion, là où il serait plus naturel de trouver les membres du sacerdoce. Zacharie, quant à lui, ouvre au grand-prêtre une porte dont seuls les prophètes connaissaient le secret. Il y a dans ces textes des entrecroisements de traditions qui témoignent de recherches tâtonnantes et probablement aussi des tensions qui ont dû exister à l'époque postexilique. Ex 24,11 est plutôt le reflet d'une tentative de conciliation entre deux groupes principaux, le sacerdoce et l'institution des anciens. L'expérience de Dieu et le patronnage de Moïse fondent à eux seuls le pouvoir et la responsabilité des uns et des autres. Cette expérience est située sur la montagne du Sinaï, aux origines de l'histoire d'Israël comme peuple. La vision et le repas scellent la communion de cette autorité plurielle<sup>(88)</sup>.

Institut biblique pontifical  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Jean Louis SKA SJ

## SUMMARY

The meal in Exod 24,11 has often been interpreted as a covenant meal. Other interpretations, e.g. as a cultic meal, are more or less in the same line. This article, however, suggests considering the meal and vision in Exod 24,9-11 as elements which confirm the authority of the leaders of Israel, that is, the members of the priesthood and the elders. They alone are worthy successors of Moses. The article goes on to examine the dating of the text and shows that it is preferable to see it as a post-exilic composition. The analysis of texts such as Isa 24,23 and Zech 3,7 confirms this opinion.

<sup>(88)</sup> Dans le Nouveau Testament, ces deux groupes se retrouvent ensemble, parfois accompagnés des scribes, en Mt 16,21 (// Mc 8,31; Lc 9,22); 26,3.47 (// Mc 14,43); 27,1.3.12.20.41; 28,11-12; Mc 11,27; 14,53; 15,1; Lc 20,1; 22,52; Ac 4,23; 23,14; 24,1; 25,15.

## **The Literary and Theological Significance of Misunderstanding in the Gospel of Luke**

Luke frequently depicts characters in the Gospel as incorrectly understanding or as failing to understand Jesus' proclamation and identity<sup>(1)</sup>. This paper will investigate the extent, purpose and effect of this feature of Luke's narrative. I will show how misunderstanding functions as a literary device and as an aspect of Luke's theological perspective.

Luke's Gospel includes a number of different types of failures to understand. This study will include as instances of misunderstanding those episodes which show that characters incorrectly understand Jesus' words or those of an inspired messenger as well as pericopes which indicate that they do not understand or perceive at all.

The first task of this study will be to show that misunderstanding is a concern emphasized by Luke in the way he edited his sources and composed his narrative. I will do this by first identifying the passages in Luke's Gospel in which misunderstanding occurs. After this I will show that in some cases Luke's narrative emphasizes the inability of those around Jesus to comprehend his words and deeds to a greater extent than Mark's narrative. The second part of the paper will discuss how the motif of misunderstanding contributes to the coherence of the narrative and expresses the evangelist's point of view. The concluding section will discuss the theological implications of misunderstanding as a part of Luke's literary design.

<sup>(1)</sup> Many authors have noted this interest in Luke's Gospel; most notably J.D. KINGSBURY, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis 1991) 109-110, 117-121, 124-125, 127-139; S.D. MOORE, "Luke's Economy of Knowledge", *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* (ed. D. LULL) (Atlanta 1989); G. NUTTAL, *The Moment of Recognition* (London 1978).

## I. Misunderstanding as a Distinctive Characteristic of Luke's Story of Jesus

### 1. *Identifying the Motif of Misunderstanding in Luke's Gospel*

#### a. Narrative descriptions of characters' inability to understand

The first and clearest statement by the narrator that characters are unable to understand Jesus occurs in the story of the boy Jesus in the temple. The narrator states in Luke 2,49-50 that Mary and Joseph did not understand Jesus' enigmatic assertion that he must be involved in the things of his father (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς). In three cases later in the Gospel (9,45; 18,34; 24,16), the narrator describes the disciples as having been prevented from perceiving. In both 9,45 and 18,34, the meaning of Jesus' passion predictions is concealed from the disciples. In 24,16, the disciples on the road to Emmaus are prevented from recognizing the risen Jesus. All three of these passages use the passive voice (ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον [9,45], κεκρυμμένον [18,34], ἐκρατοῦντο [24,16]) to convey the sense that the disciples' inability to understand Jesus' words or recognize him was caused by a force outside of themselves. This use of the passive voice is generally identified as the divine passive<sup>(2)</sup>.

#### b. Narrative descriptions of characters' faulty understanding

In other passages, the narrator reports words and actions of the disciples that indicate an incorrect or incomplete comprehension of Jesus' words. In 9,46-48, Jesus perceives their argument about greatness, thus showing that they have failed to see that following Jesus involves service and humility. Immediately following this scene, in 9,49-50, their attempt to prevent someone not associated with them from exorcising in Jesus' name shows again that they do

(2) F. B. CRADDOCK *Luke* (Interpretation; Louisville 1990) 137, 216; J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28-28A; Garden City, NY 1981; 1985) 814, 1208, 1563; I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids 1978) 394, 691, 893; A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1981) 256, 552; E. S. SCHWEIZER, *The Good News According to Luke* (Atlanta 1984) 163; R. C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia 1989) 282. Tannehill (227), however, stresses that human resistance to the will of God is also an important element in the disciples' inability to understand Jesus' passion predictions in 9,45 and 18,34.

not comprehend what following Jesus entails. Their misunderstanding manifests itself again when they attempt to prevent people from bringing infants to Jesus (18,15) and at the last supper, when they again argue about greatness (22,24). During the arrest scene (22,50-51), the disciples' violent attempt to prevent his arrest shows once more a misplaced loyalty and a failure to accept that Jesus' destiny is to suffer.

On three occasions, the narrator reports assumptions of characters which show they do not correctly understand Jesus or his mission. The Pharisee's unspoken statement in 7,39 shows that he assumes that if Jesus were a prophet and therefore knew that the woman was a sinner, he would not associate with her. What he fails to comprehend is the fact that the woman's actions show her repentance and that Jesus' mission is to bring forgiveness to sinners. In 19,11, the evangelist introduces the parable of the pounds by stating that "they believed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately". The parable corrects this false assumption and asserts that what is important is not the length of the interval before the kingdom arrives but rather the way in which disciples use that time. The third instance of this type of misunderstanding occurs in 24,37 where the disciples "suppose" that the risen Jesus is a ghost. This assumption shows an incomplete understanding of the resurrection.

### c. Words of Jesus

In three separate passages, Jesus indicates that knowledge has been hidden. In 8,9-10, he says that while knowledge has been given to the disciples, the mysteries of the kingdom are in parables for others so that "they may not understand"; thereby implying that the knowledge given to the disciples has been withheld from others. More explicitly, in 10,21, Jesus thanks God for hiding "these things from the wise and the understanding". He then asserts that knowledge of the father is given only to those whom the son chooses (10,22). The emphasis on revelation and knowledge continues in 10,24, where the disciples are told that they have seen and heard what prophets and kings have not. Jesus' lament over Jerusalem in 19,42 also explicitly mentions the concealment of knowledge<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(3)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative Unity*, 227, notes the resemblance between the narrator's statement that the meaning of Jesus' words were hidden from the eyes of the disciples in 9,45 and Jesus' lament in 19,42 that the things that make for peace are hidden from the city's eyes.

Because Jerusalem has failed to recognize what makes for peace, that knowledge is now hidden from them. These passages, which present understanding as being completely absent and not simply incorrect, emphasize that the ability to see, hear and understand the revelation of God in Jesus is a gift from God and not a matter of human ability.

#### d. Words of other characters

Other passages suggest this motif by depicting characters as asking questions that express false assumptions about Jesus and his mission<sup>(4)</sup>. During the first part of Jesus' ministry (4,14-9,50) various characters ask questions about Jesus' identity which imply incorrect understandings of Jesus' words and deeds. In 4,22, the people in the Nazareth synagogue acknowledge (ἐμαρτύρουν) Jesus' announcement that the prophecy of Isaiah was being fulfilled in their midst with wonder (ἐθαύμαζον) and the question "Is this not the son of Joseph?" While neither the question nor the context suggest that the people reject Jesus' announcement, neither do they indicate that they understand the significance of Jesus' claims in 4,18-19.21<sup>(5)</sup>. Jesus' reaction to this question (4,23-24) underscores its implications; they assume that because he is Joseph's son, he should do in Nazareth what he has done in other towns. Thus this question indicates the townspeople's failure to recognize that Jesus' ministry is determined by his divine sonship and his endowment with the Spirit (see especially 3,21-22; 4,1.14.18) and not by his physical kinship<sup>(6)</sup>. In 5,21 and 7,49, people question Jesus' claim to have the power to forgive sins. John the Baptist's question in 7,19, "Are you the one to come or shall we look for another?" recalls his prediction in 3,16-17 that "one who is mightier than I is coming", and that this one would carry out the final purification of Israel. Jesus' response shows that John's view of the Coming One is inadequate because it does not take into consideration the

<sup>(4)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 48.

<sup>(5)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 535, maintains that the question in 4,22 expresses pleasant surprise or admiration, not rejection or anger.

<sup>(6)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 58; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 68. Tannehill maintains that Jesus' announcement in 4,18-19 implies that he is the Son of God. This aspect of Jesus' character, however, is not conveyed by the citation from Isaiah 61,1-2; 58,6.

significance of Jesus' ministry of word and deed as indicators of his identity<sup>(7)</sup>. In 8,22-25, the disciples question Jesus' identity as a result of his control of the seas. They fail to perceive that Jesus' ability to command the elements manifests his divine nature. Herod's question in 9,9 about Jesus' identity shows that he has failed to understand Jesus' relationship to the prophets and John the Baptist. James' and John's question about whether they should bid fire to come down after the Samaritan towns rejected Jesus (9,54) shows that not only do they not understand the proper response to rejection but also that they do not correctly understand Jesus' identity in relation to Elijah. While none of these questions indicate a complete lack of comprehension on the part of the characters, they do indicate that Luke often presents the reactions to Jesus' words and deeds as expressing false assumptions about his identity and mission.

In 9,13.33 and 22,38 the disciples make statements that show that their comprehension of Jesus' words is incomplete. Their words in 9,13 show that they fail to understand Jesus' command to provide food for the crowds. They incorrectly assume that Jesus intended for them to buy food for the crowd. Peter's words in 9,33 as well as the narrative aside informing the readers that he did not know what he was saying suggests that he did not understand the significance of the appearance of the heavenly guests nor did he understand that the revelation of glory was only temporary<sup>(8)</sup>. In 22,38, the disciples take literally Jesus' command to buy swords and offer him two swords. They understand Jesus' words as a call to prepare for armed conflict, when the actual intent of Jesus' warning is to prepare them for the hardship that lies ahead; hardship most clearly seen in the prediction that Jesus will fulfill Isa 53,12 and be treated as a criminal<sup>(9)</sup>.

Statements of other characters in 9,59.61; 10,38-42; 11,27-28; 12,13 also convey a failure to understand Jesus. The words of the

(7) KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 41.

(8) MARSHALL, *Luke*, 386-387.

(9) G. W. H. LAMPE, "The Two Swords (Luke 22:35-38)", *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (eds. E. Bammel-C. Moule) (Cambridge 1984) 341; MARSHALL, *Commentary*, 825; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 268; D. M. SWEETLAND, "The Lord's Supper and the Lukan Community", *BTB* 13 (1983) 26.



would-be followers of Jesus in 9,59.61 as well as Martha's complaint in 10,40 show that they have an incomplete knowledge of what is required of Jesus' disciples. The woman's blessing and Jesus' response in 11,27-28 indicate that she has a faulty view of true blessedness. Finally the man's request that Jesus make a judgment on inheritance (12,13) indicates that he does not understand Jesus' mission.

In summary, Luke has portrayed all classes of characters as failing in some way to understand who Jesus is and what his word means. He does this in a number of ways: by simply stating that they did not understand at all, by reporting questions and statements that betray incomplete comprehension and by describing actions and assumptions that stem from a lack of or an incorrect perception.

## 2. *Misunderstanding as a Lucan Emphasis*

While some of the emphasis on misunderstanding may be inherited from Mark's Gospel (see Luke 8,25 and Mark 4,40; Luke 9,45 and Mark 9,31), it is also clear that Luke has incorporated Marcan material in ways which both mitigate the negative elements of Mark's portrayal of the disciples<sup>(10)</sup> and emphasize the failure of the disciples and others to understand Jesus correctly.

In Mark's version of the rejection at Nazareth, the people's immediate reaction to Jesus was negative (Mark 6,3). They ask "Where did this man get all this?... Is this not the carpenter, the son of Mary...?" (Mark 6,2-3). Mark sums up the reaction by noting that the people were scandalized by him (ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ). Luke's use of the phrase ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος suggests more a bewildered acknowledgement of him<sup>(11)</sup>. The question, "Is this not Joseph's son?"

<sup>(10)</sup> K. N. GILES, "The Church in the Gospel of Luke", *SJT* 34 (1981) 121-146.

<sup>(11)</sup> J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (SBT 24; Naperville, IL 1958) 44-46, argues that the verb ἐμαρτύρουν followed by the dative αὐτῷ should be translated as "witnessed against". The arguments against this view are more convincing; see H. J. B. COMBRINK, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30", *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973) 37; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 534-535; J. NOLLAND, "Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 4:22)", *JBL* 98 (1979) 220; F. Ó FEARGHAIL, "Rejection in Nazareth: Luke 4:22", *ZNW* 75 (1984) 62-67.

therefore, conveys not a rejection of him as the questions in the parallel pericopes do, but rather a failure to perceive that his announcement identifies him as the promised savior and the fulfillment of all of God's promises<sup>(12)</sup>.

Luke's version of Jesus' explanation of the reason for parables in 8,9-10 follows the parallel passage from Mark quite closely, except that Luke says that the disciples receive *knowledge* of mysteries (Luke 8,10), whereas in Mark they have been given "the mystery" (Mark 4,11)<sup>(13)</sup>. Also Luke abbreviates the description of the results of parables for others by leaving off the last clause of Mark 4,12: "lest they should turn and be forgiven". Thus the final stress in Luke's version of this pericope lands on the inability of others to understand in contrast to disciples who are given knowledge.

The Lucan version of the storm at sea (8,22-25) presents a much less negative picture of the disciples; and yet, it still presents them as unable to understand Jesus' powers. In Luke, the disciples do not accuse Jesus of not caring whether they perish as they do in Mark 4,38; instead, they simply state that they are perishing (Luke 8,24). The Lucan Jesus asks his disciples, "Where is your faith?" (Luke 8,25) rather than "Have you no faith?" (Mark 4,40). In both versions, the disciples respond to Jesus' mighty act by asking, "Who is this...?" However, because Luke presents the disciples as fearful rather than faithless, their question does not confirm their lack of faith as it does in Mark; instead, it expresses their inability to fully comprehend the significance of powerful acts of Jesus<sup>(14)</sup>. Jesus' ability to control the wind and the water confirm what has been indicated earlier in the Gospel about his identity — that he is the divinely appointed messenger who speaks and acts with the authority and saving power of God (see 4,18-19; 5,20-24; 7,48; 8,10.21) and that in him God is present to his people (7,16). The disciples' question about his identity indicates that they have not yet fully understood that the powerful deeds and works of Jesus show him to be the manifestation of God among them.

<sup>(12)</sup> R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke 4:16-30", *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin 1972) 53. Cf. Ó FEARGHAIL, "Rejection", 70.

<sup>(13)</sup> MARSHALL, *Commentary*, 323.

<sup>(14)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 730.

While Mark's Gospel contains the report to Herod of opinions about Jesus which Luke uses in 9,8, the Marcan version ends with Herod's statement that he believes Jesus to be John the Baptist risen from the dead (Mark 6,16). Luke's version ends, on the other hand, with Herod's assertion that since John had been beheaded, he did not know who Jesus could be. The Lucan version clearly highlights Herod's bewilderment about Jesus' identity.

Luke's version of Mark's second and third passion prediction — Luke 9,44-45 and 18,31-34 — highlights the concealment of knowledge. The Marcan parallel to Luke 9,44-45 — Mark 9,31-32 — includes a more detailed passion prediction than Luke's followed by a simple statement that the disciples did not understand it. Luke abbreviates the passion prediction, prefaces it with Jesus' command to listen carefully ("Let these words sink into your ears") and explains the disciples' failure to understand by stating "it was concealed from them so that they should not perceive it". Luke's redaction of the Marcan material, then, emphasizes the importance of understanding Jesus' words about his destined suffering and the disciples' inability to do so<sup>(15)</sup>. Mark 10,32-34, the parallel to Luke 18,31-34, makes no mention of either their failure to understand or the concealment of the meaning of Jesus' sayings. Luke also includes in the passion prediction an emphasis on the fact that Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection will fulfill "everything written of the Son of Man by the prophets" (18,31). What is hidden from the disciples, therefore, is not only the meaning of Jesus' words but also the understanding of scripture.

It is also important to note that the motif of misunderstanding frequently occurs in sections of Luke's Gospel which have no parallel in Mark. Both the beginning and the ending of Luke's Gospel contain episodes which emphasize the inability of the characters to perceive the meaning of the things that are happening and the words being spoken to them (2,41-51; 24,16.37-49). While the story of the woman anointing Jesus in 7,36-50 bears some resemblance to Mark 14,3-9, it is clear that Luke's story is completely distinctive in purpose and content. The Central Section of Luke's Gospel (9,51-19,44) also frequently portrays those around Jesus as misunderstanding him (9,54-56.57-62; 10,38-42; 11,27-28; 12,12-21; 13,1-5; 19,11.42). Finally, Luke's additions to the Last Supper scene also highlight the disciples' incomprehension (22,35-38).

(15) TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 226.

## II. The Literary Significance of Misunderstanding

An effective way to understand the significance of this feature of Luke's narrative is to examine carefully what it is that the characters fail to comprehend. Doing this will make it possible to show how misunderstanding contributes to the coherence of the story.

### 1. *Failures to Understand Jesus' Message*

Jesus' announcements of his destiny consistently meet with incomprehension. The child Jesus' announcement that he "must be about the things of my father" only heightens his parents' bewilderment. The meaning of his second and third passion predictions is concealed from his disciples. The still-unrecognized risen Jesus upbraids the disciples on the road to Emmaus as fools (ἄνοητοι) for failing to realize the necessity of the Christ's suffering and death (24,25).

Less obvious failures to understand Jesus' destiny are expressed by Peter's desire to build booths for Jesus, Elijah and Moses in 9,33 and the disciples' eagerness to produce swords in 22,38.49-51. Peter's words in 9,33 suggest a failure to understand that the revelation of Jesus' glory and the appearance of Moses and Elijah did not represent the eschatological coming of the kingdom. Peter has failed to understand that Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection must occur first<sup>(16)</sup>. The disciples' offer of two swords to Jesus (22,38) and their use of them in 22,49-51 indicate that they have not understood any of Jesus' teachings about the necessity of his suffering and death for the fulfillment of scripture, and neither do they understand that in their continuation of Jesus' ministry, they are destined to share in the rejection and hostility to which Jesus had been subjected. While their first missionary expeditions met with acceptance and success (9,1-6; 10,1-12.17-20), Jesus' new instructions warn them that from now on (ἀλλὰ νῦν) they will meet with rejection and hostility. The mention of swords is symbolic of the defensive posture which the disciples will have to adopt in their effort to carry out the mission given them by Jesus<sup>(17)</sup>. Their offer

<sup>(16)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 801; MARSHALL, *Commentary*, 387.

<sup>(17)</sup> C. A. EVANS, *Luke* (NIBC; Peabody, MA 1990) 319; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1430; LAMPE, "The Two Swords", 336-338.

of two swords and their actions in the garden, however, show that they mistakenly believe that faithfulness to Jesus means that they should use violence to prevent his destined arrest and suffering, and that Jesus was warning them to be prepared for an eschatological battle such as was expected by popular apocalyptic messianism<sup>(18)</sup>.

On two occasions, people fail to understand Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God. In 8,10, Jesus states that the parables conceal the secrets of the Kingdom of God from "the others". In 19,11, people suppose that the appearance of the Kingdom of God was imminent. The subsequent parable of the pounds emphasizes the delay<sup>(19)</sup>.

Like Luke 8,10, Luke 10,21-24 and 19,42.44 also indicate that Jesus' revelation has been concealed from some people. Jesus' prayer in 10,21-24 emphasizes that only the Son reveals knowledge of the father and that this knowledge has been hidden from the wise and understanding. In 19,41-44, Jesus laments that the knowledge of "what makes for peace" will be hidden from Jerusalem's eyes because it has failed to recognize Jesus as the visitation of God (see Luke 1,68; 7,16)<sup>(20)</sup>.

Many of the instances of failures to understand Jesus' message function as plot devices in that they foreshadow future events. The widely noted observation that the infancy narrative introduces the important themes of the rest of Luke's work is true of the theme of misunderstanding. The inability of Mary and Joseph to understand the necessity of Jesus being "about the things of his father" (2,49-50) prepares for the repeated failure of those around Jesus to comprehend his statements about his destiny (9,33.45; 18,34)<sup>(21)</sup>. The fact that the disciples had never understood Jesus' passion predictions prepares for their confusion during the arrest scene

(18) EVANS, *Luke* 320; J. M. FORD, *My Enemy is My Guest; Jesus and Violence in Luke* (Maryknoll, NY 1984) 114, 116; P. S. MINEAR, "A Note on Luke xxii 36", *NT* 7 (1964) 130.

(19) J. LAMBRECHT, "Reading and Re-reading Lk 18:31-22:6", *À Cause de l'Évangile* (ed. F. REFOULÉ) (Paris 1985) 600-601.

(20) FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1256.

(21) E. S. FIORENZA, "Luke 2:41-52", *Int* 36 (1982) 400; L. T. JOHNSON, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, MN 1991) 61; J. KILGALLAN, "Luke 2,41-50: Foreshadowing Jesus, Teacher", *Bib* 66 (1985) 559; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 54; F. D. WEINERT, "The Multiple Meanings of Luke 2:49 and their Significance", *BTB* 13 (1983) 19.

(22,49-51)<sup>(22)</sup> and their inability to recognize the risen Jesus (24,16.25).

The repeated emphasis on the concealment of knowledge (8,10; 9,45; 10,21-24; 18,34; 19,42) heightens the irony of the story by producing a disparity between the readers' understanding and that of the characters<sup>(23)</sup>. In 8,9-10, Jesus asserts that the disciples have been given knowledge of the mysteries of the Kingdom, while it has been concealed from others. Yet the readers are told that it is the disciples who ask the meaning of the parable (8,9). Hence, while Jesus tells the disciples that they have been given knowledge, the narrator tells the readers that they do not quite understand. The statements in 9,44-45; 18,34 and 19,42 also indicate that knowledge has been concealed, while at the same time, they actually reveal to the readers precisely the information that is hidden from the characters. Luke 9,44-45 and 18,31-34 inform the readers of the necessity and significance of Jesus' death; the very information that is kept from the disciples. Jesus' lament in 19,41-44 reminds readers that what is necessary for peace is the recognition of Jesus as the anointed of God (see 19,38). Irony functions as a device which enhances the readers' identification with the point of view of the narrator; they know what the narrator knows and what the characters cannot.

The ironic description of the disciples as those who have been given knowledge while others have been kept from it (8,10; 10,21-24) also creates suspense. Even though Jesus describes the disciples as having knowledge of the secrets of the kingdom of God and as having seen and heard what prophets and kings have not, the narrator consistently portrays them as blind and unknowledgeable. This discrepancy raises the question of when the disciples will manifest the understanding that is supposedly given to them. This question is satisfied to a great extent in the climactic appearances of the resurrected Jesus. It is at this point that he interprets and opens all of scripture for them and that he opens their eyes and minds so that they can recognize him as the fulfillment of all of God's promises<sup>(24)</sup>.

<sup>(22)</sup> LAMPE, "Two Swords", 335.

<sup>(23)</sup> M. A. POWELL, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis 1990) 30.

<sup>(24)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 281.

## 2. Failure to Perceive Jesus' Identity

In 4,22, the people of Nazareth mistakenly attempt to understand Jesus' mission and identity in terms of his human family. In 5,21; 7,49; 8,25; 9,9 various characters ask "Who is this?" in response to Jesus' forgiveness of sins (5,21; 7,49), his ability to command the forces of nature (8,25) and the reports of his marvelous deeds (9,9)<sup>(25)</sup>.

Numerous misunderstandings concern Jesus' prophetic identity. The question of John the Baptist in 7,19-20 ("Are you the Coming One?") attempts to cast him as *Elias redivivus*. While the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος could refer to a number of eschatological figures expected in first century Judaism (e.g. royal messiah of Zech 9,9; the messianic figures described in 1 QS 9,11; 4QpBless 3 and 4QTestim 1-8; or the prophet-like-Moses alluded to in Acts 3,22-23), the placement and composition of this pericope indicate that Luke intended to suggest that John the Baptist was asking whether Jesus was the returning Elijah. Luke introduces the passage by stating that John's question was provoked by reports of "all these things" that Jesus had done<sup>(26)</sup>. The nearest antecedent to "these things" is the preceding story of the raising of the widow's son, which clearly presents Jesus as a great prophet whose mighty acts resemble those of Elijah (see especially Luke 7,15-16 and 1 Kgs 17,17-24)<sup>(27)</sup>.

Related misunderstandings occur in 7,39 and 9,54. In each of these cases, those around Jesus incorrectly understand Jesus' prophetic identity. The Pharisee in 7,39 doubts that Jesus is a prophet because he expects him to announce God's condemnation of sinners and not forgiveness of repentant sinners. By asking if they should bid fire to come down on those who reject Jesus' message (Luke 9,54), James and John are clearly associating Jesus with the Elijah who called fire down on those who do not listen to the word

<sup>(25)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 48.

<sup>(26)</sup> T. L. BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37", *Bib* 64 (1983) 465; J. DAWSEY, *Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon, GA 1986) 129; G. R. GREENE, "The Portrayal of Jesus as a Prophet in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975) 92; H. GUY, *NT Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London 33-34).

<sup>(27)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 666; T. L. BRODIE, "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of I Kings 17:17-24", *NTS* 32 (1986) 249, 257.

of God (2 Kgs 1,10.12). Jesus' rebuke reinforces once again that while he resembles Elijah, he is not *Elias redivivus* <sup>(28)</sup>.

A further mistaken impression of Jesus' identity occurs in 12,13. The man's request that Jesus make a judgment about the division of an inheritance implies a view of Jesus who, as a religious teacher and interpreter of the Torah, would be expected to decide such matters (the Pentateuch treats questions of inheritance in several places, including Deut 21,15-17; Num 27,1-11; 36,7-9). Jesus rejects this role in no uncertain terms <sup>(29)</sup>.

In a different way the disciples fail to recognize the identity of the risen Jesus in chapter 24. On the road to Emmaus, they are prevented from recognizing Jesus at all (24,16). In v. 37, the disciples perceive that what they see appears to be Jesus, but they do not recognize him as Jesus who has been raised from the dead. Instead, they suppose he is a πνεῦμα — a disembodied spirit of a person who remains dead <sup>(30)</sup>. The problem here is how the Jesus who preached and healed and was crucified is related to the risen Lord. The disciples either fail entirely to make the connection between the crucified Jesus and the risen Lord (24,16) or they make an incorrect connection (24,37).

The portrayal of those around Jesus as being unable to correctly comprehend who he is constitutes one of Luke's primary means of developing Jesus' character. The reports of incorrect assessments of Jesus' role allow Luke to present further information about his true identity. By reporting that people were baffled by Jesus' actions, Luke highlights aspects of Jesus' character that he considers crucial.

Jesus' response to the people of Nazareth's assessment of him as Joseph's son (4,22) does not explicitly reject this identification of him, yet it does make clear that the people's perception of him as Joseph's son does not entitle them to special claims on his mission. While readers already know from the previous narrative that Jesus is not actually Joseph's son (1,34-35; 2,23), Jesus' words stress an

<sup>(28)</sup> DAWSEY, *Voice*, 130; J. DRURY, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (Atlanta 1977) 147; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 230.

<sup>(29)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 968-969; JOHNSON, *Luke*, 198, MARSHALL, *Commentary*, 523.

<sup>(30)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1575; JOHNSON, *Luke*, 401, 405; *TDNT* VI, 379, 415.



aspect of his true identity which had not been fully developed up to this point in the narrative: he is the anointed messenger of God's good news who is destined to be rejected by his own people<sup>(31)</sup>.

The attempts to cast Jesus in the role of *Elias redivivus* by calling him "the one who is to come" (7,19-20) or by his disciples' suggestion that they should replicate Elijah's response to rejection (9,54) delineate the ways in which Jesus does not resemble Elijah, just as other passages indicate how Jesus resembles Elijah (see especially 4,25-27; 7,11-17 and 9,51). Jesus' answer to John the Baptist's question (7,22) emphasizes his prophetic and prophecy-fulfilling mission, but he does not accept the appellation of "the One who is to Come" or the identification as *Elias redivivus* implied by it. While the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος alludes to an Elijah-like messenger of God who would restore pure worship of Yahweh and bring God's wrath against the enemies of Israel and the unfaithful in Israel (see Mal 3,1-3.23-24), Jesus presents himself in 7,22 as the messenger of God's salvation foreseen by Isaiah (see Isa 26,19; 29,18; 35,5.6; 61,1) who also resembles Elijah in his power to restore life. While Jesus' response does not deny his resemblance to the prophet Elijah, he does reject the idea that he is a reincarnation of Elijah.

Similarly, the false view of Jesus' prophetic role expressed by the Pharisee's assumption that as a prophet Jesus should condemn the woman who anointed him as a sinner can be contrasted with presentations of Jesus' prophetic role elsewhere in the narrative (see especially 4,18-19.24-25; 6,20-26; 7,11-17; 9,22.35.44.51; 13,33-35; 18,31-35; 22,63-65; 24,19; Acts 3,22-23; 7,35-38). The story itself suggests that Jesus was a prophet because he knew what the Pharisee was thinking and he knew that the woman had repented of her sins<sup>(32)</sup>. The emphasis on Jesus' authority to forgive the woman's sins (Luke 7,47.48.49) stresses that while Jesus may indeed exhibit prophetic characteristics, he far surpasses the prophetic tradition of Israel<sup>(33)</sup>.

<sup>(31)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 68.

<sup>(32)</sup> See B. C. FREIN, "The Literary Significance of the Jesus-as-Prophet Motif in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. diss.: St. Louis University, 1989), especially 161-166.

<sup>(33)</sup> Although it is not unheard of that a prophet would announce the forgiveness of sins (e.g., Isa 40,2; Jer 31,34; 33,8), Luke's narrative clearly indicates that Jesus is doing more than announcing that God has forgiven

The man's request in 12,13 that Jesus rule on the division of an inheritance provides an opportunity to distinguish Jesus from other religious teachers and to emphasize his detachment from questions of material wealth.

The disciples' assumption that the risen Jesus was a "ghost" (πνεῦμα) sets the stage for the presentation of the risen one as continuous with the crucified Jesus; he is not a shadowy specter but a complete person who is present to them in body and spirit and who shares meals with them now as he did in the past.

The passages which emphasize that people did not perceive Jesus' identity by reporting that they wondered who he was (5,21; 7,49; 8,25; 9,9) represent another technique of character development. The characters' questions, Who is this who... forgives sins (5,21; 7,49), commands the wind and the seas (8,25) or is known throughout the region for healing and casting out demons (9,7-9), reiterate for the readers aspects of Jesus' character that are crucial. The readers have been informed from the beginning of the Gospel that Jesus is the Son of God (1,32; 3,22), the savior (2,11), Christ (2,11.26) and the Spirit-endowed messenger of Good News (3,22; 4,1.14.18). The actions of Jesus, which cause other characters to question his identity, confirm and interpret what the readers already know about Jesus.

The disciples' inability to recognize the presence of Jesus on the road to Emmaus allows them to express their incomplete but essentially correct view of Jesus (24,19-24)<sup>(34)</sup>, on which the still-unrecognized risen Jesus expands (vv. 25-27). What prevents the disciples from understanding the events of the recent past and from recognizing Jesus in the present is their inability to understand that the fulfillment of scripture required the suffering of Christ<sup>(35)</sup>. The sequence of events in this story (Jesus' interpretation of scripture followed by the breaking of bread and the disciples' recognition of Jesus) as well as Luke's report of the disciples' words after Jesus had vanished from their midst ("Were our hearts not burning within us

---

the woman. The question "Who is this who forgives sins?" suggests that Jesus also effects this forgiveness. See J. J. KILGALLAN, "A Proposal for Interpreting Luke 7,36-50", *Bib* 72 (1991) 321.

<sup>(34)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 280-281.

<sup>(35)</sup> R. J. DILLON, *From Eyewitness to Minister of the Word* (AnBib 82; Rome 1978) 129, 132; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 253, 282.

while he talked to us on the road, while he opened to us the scripture?" Luke 24,32) strongly suggest that the recognition of the risen Jesus requires an understanding of scripture from the viewpoint of the resurrection and a recognition of his presence in the breaking of bread.

Luke's emphasis on the failure of those around Jesus to understand his identity also contributes to his portrayal of the disciples, the crowd and various opponents of Jesus. The Nazarenes' failure to understand the implications of Jesus' proclamation in the synagogue is typical of other humans in the Gospel. Encounters with Jesus repeatedly result in perplexed questioning about his identity<sup>(36)</sup>. By having members of all three of these groups ask "Who is this...?" (scribes and Pharisees, 5,2; Herod, 9,9; disciples, 8,25; the crowd, 7,49), the evangelist suggests that it is not the disciples' superior understanding of Jesus that distinguishes them from the others but rather their loyalty and their willingness to follow Jesus. They may not fully comprehend Jesus' identity, but they are never portrayed as reluctant to follow Jesus.

### 3. *The Nature and Demands of Discipleship*

By locating the multiplication of the loaves (9,12-17) immediately after the return of the twelve from their mission (9,10-11) and by mentioning the apostles (v.10) and the twelve (v.12) twice at the beginning the passage, Luke emphasizes that it is the same group who have been given power and authority over all demons and who share Jesus' mission to preach the good news of the Kingdom who also balk at Jesus' command to give the people food in the desert (9,13). Their objection to Jesus' command to provide food reveals that they do not comprehend the implications of Jesus' call to preach good news, nor do they perceive that they share in his power<sup>(37)</sup>. Their misunderstanding of the intent of Jesus' command shows that they do not understand that following Jesus means participating in his ministry.

Luke indicates that the disciples' blindness to the necessity of Jesus' suffering also prevents them from understanding that following Jesus does not involve human greatness or exclusivity by

<sup>(36)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 48.

<sup>(37)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 118.

placing the report of their argument about greatness (9,46-48) and the account of the strange exorcist (9,49-50) immediately after the note that the meaning of the second passion prediction was hidden from them<sup>(38)</sup>. Similar instances of this lack of perception occur in 18,15 and 22,24.

The words of the would-be followers of Jesus in 9,59.61 express a different kind of misunderstanding. Obviously what is misunderstood here is the urgency of Jesus' call and the primacy it must claim over all other commitments. But the resemblances between Jesus' interchanges with these would-be followers and the story of Elijah's call of Elisha (1 Kgs 19,19-21) as well as the references to other parts of the Elijah tradition in the preceding passages (4,25-27; 7,11-17.18-23; 9,51.54) suggest that Luke is also concerned with showing how followers of Jesus differ from followers of Elijah. Whereas Jesus may resemble Elijah in that his ministry will be accepted by those outside of Israel (4,25), and that he has the power to restore life to the dead (7,11-16), and that he will be "taken up" as Elijah was (9,51), he supersedes Elijah in that his call is more urgent and it requires a sudden break with all that has gone before<sup>(39)</sup>.

The story of Martha and Mary (10,38-42) records a more subtle misunderstanding of discipleship. Martha's διακονίαν is not outrightly rejected, but it must be subordinated to listening to Jesus' words (10,38-42)<sup>(40)</sup>. Like the dialogues with the would-be followers in 9,59.61, this passage emphasizes that discipleship involves placing attention to Jesus' instruction over all other concerns.

The final example of the disciples' failure to comprehend what was required of them in order to follow Jesus is found in Luke 22,49. Their actions show that not only do they persist in their inability to understand the necessity of Jesus' suffering but they have also failed to understand Jesus' teaching about the love of enemies (Luke 6,27-35).

<sup>(38)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 254, notes the connection between the inability of the disciples to understand the necessity of Jesus' suffering and other failures of comprehension, especially of the demands of discipleship.

<sup>(39)</sup> C. A. EVANS, "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election", *JBL* 106 (1987) 81.

<sup>(40)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 892.

Most obviously the emphasis on the disciples' failure to understand what Jesus asks from them contributes to the development of the collective character of the disciples. On the one hand, they are privileged in that they have been chosen by Jesus (5,1-11.27-28; 6,12-16). They are given knowledge of the mysteries of the Kingdom (8,10); they are the ones to whom Jesus has chosen to reveal the Father (10,21-24). In 9,1-6 they are given the power and authority to assist in Jesus' mission of proclaiming the Good News. Three of them see Jesus' glory on the mountain (9,28-35), and Jesus promises them a share in his eschatological reign (22,28-30). On the other hand, in spite of these privileges, they consistently fail to perceive the true significance of Jesus' words and actions. Since they do not understand who Jesus is, they fail to recognize what is required of them as his followers. Their fear and amazement at Jesus' control over the sea suggests that they did not fully comprehend Jesus' assertion that they would receive knowledge of the secrets of the Kingdom. In spite of the fact that they had been given the power to heal and the ability to preach the Kingdom of God, they refuse to provide food for the people<sup>(41)</sup>. Their inability to understand the second passion prediction (9,45) follows closely on the revelation of Jesus' glory in the transfiguration (9,28-35) and precedes the account of their mistaken view of discipleship (9,46-50). In spite of Jesus' persistent reminders that he was destined to suffer and die before being raised, the disciples attempt to show their loyalty to him by defending him against his arresters with swords (22,49-51). After the crucifixion, they believe that all their hopes had been disappointed and that their discipleship had ended with Jesus' death (24,19-24).

The final scene of the Gospel, which depicts the twelve as worshipping the ascended Jesus (24,52), suggests that they have finally come to understand not only who Jesus is but what is required of a disciple. Luke's story strongly suggests that it is impossible to grasp the meaning of true discipleship apart from the recognition of the risen and exalted Lord.

<sup>(41)</sup> KINGSBURY, *Conflict*, 117.

## Conclusion

### Theological Implications

The plot of Luke's Gospel, with its emphasis on the inability of even Jesus' closest companions to understand his proclamation, focuses on human blindness in the face of divine revelation<sup>(42)</sup>. Luke's Gospel consistently presents the course of events as following God's plan which is announced by the angels, John the Baptist, and Jesus and attested to by scripture; and which is only accomplished by God's power<sup>(43)</sup>. By portraying those around Jesus as blind to the meaning of these events until the resurrection appearances and the ascension of Jesus, Luke conveys his conviction that an understanding of God's will and power is impossible apart from the acceptance of the necessity of Jesus' death, an understanding of scripture mediated by the risen Jesus, a perception of the presence of the Lord in the breaking of bread, and a recognition of Jesus as the exalted Lord<sup>(44)</sup>.

The emphasis on divine concealment suggests that Luke sees the inability to comprehend or perceive Jesus as part of the divine plan<sup>(45)</sup>. By reporting the concealment of the meaning of the passion predictions in 9,45 and 18,34 as well as the identity of Jesus in 24,16, Luke indicates that the comprehension of God's revelation depends not on human intelligence or even on loyalty to Jesus but rather on God's power<sup>(46)</sup>. Only the risen Jesus can open the scripture and the eyes of his disciples. However, 8,10 and 19,44 also suggest that concealment of God's revelation can be the result of human resistance to the word of God. Those who initially reject Jesus' proclamation of the Good News will find further revelation hidden from them. The ironic tone of this emphasis also suggests the paradoxical nature of revelation; in reporting such concealment, God's ways are actually revealed to the readers. The apparent hindrance of perception in fact enables readers to understand.

The way in which the evangelist has developed the character of Jesus has obvious Christological implications. The questions

<sup>(42)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 282.

<sup>(43)</sup> DILLON, *Eyewitness*, 50.

<sup>(44)</sup> MOORE, "Economy", 39-43; TANNEHILL, *Narrative*, 283.

<sup>(45)</sup> PLUMMER, *Luke*, 256; SCHWEIZER, *Luke*, 288.

<sup>(46)</sup> CRADDOCK, *Luke*, 216.

provoked by Jesus' actions serve to establish that he is the Savior who forgives sins, commands the forces of nature and heals his people. That the manifestations of these powers only raise questions in the minds of those who observe them points to another aspect of Lucan Christology: Jesus cannot be adequately understood apart from a recognition that his suffering, death, and resurrection fulfill the plan of God that was revealed in Scripture and announced by him during his ministry.

The incorrect perceptions of him (Joseph's son, "the one who is to come") contribute to other aspects of Lucan Christology. The people's question in Luke 4,22 and Jesus' response make it clear that his life and mission are determined not by human relationships but by his identity as the Son of God and by his endowment with the Spirit. Jesus' rejection of attempts to cast him as *Elias redivivus* even while he compares his own ministry to Elijah's emphasizes that as the anointed messenger of Good News who is destined to be rejected by his own, he continues the prophetic tradition of Israel; yet, because he also surpasses that tradition, he cannot be identified as a revived Elijah or as any of the other prophets of old.

Luke's portrayal of the disciples expresses his view of what Christian discipleship involves. By coordinating the disciples' inability to discern the meaning of the passion predictions with the reports of their mistaken views of discipleship (9,46-50), Luke indicates that discipleship which fails to accept the necessity of Jesus' suffering will always be misguided<sup>(47)</sup>. The story of Martha and Mary suggests that service (*διακονίαν*) that neglects the importance of listening to Jesus' word falls short of true discipleship. That the disciples never understood what was expected of them as disciples until the resurrection implies that faith in the resurrection is the essential ingredient in discipleship.

The failure of those around Jesus to correctly perceive his identity, his message and the demands of discipleship, then, plays an important role in the plot of Luke's Gospel and in the development of its characters. It is one of the ways in which Luke conveys his convictions about Jesus' identity as the Son of God and as the culmination of Israel's prophetic tradition. This device

<sup>(47)</sup> GILES, "Church", 132.

allows the evangelist to refute false views of Jesus and of discipleship. It also serves to emphasize the importance of the resurrection as the key event necessary for a full understanding of Jesus and his revelation.

Dept. of Theology and Religious Studies      Brigid Curtin FREIN  
University of Scranton  
Scranton, PA 18510-4660 USA

### SOMMAIRE

Cet article montre que l'incompréhension dans l'évangile de Luc a une fonction littéraire au sein de la théologie de l'œuvre. En premier lieu, l'article identifie trois types de passages qui décrivent l'incompréhension; les versions lucaniennes des matériaux repris à Marc soulignent l'incapacité des disciples et d'autres personnages à comprendre Jésus. Une seconde section examine comment le motif de l'incompréhension s'intègre à la trame du récit et contribue à en caractériser les acteurs. La section finale discute plusieurs éléments de la perspective théologique de Luc, notamment sa christologie et sa théologie du disciple.



## **Rejection and Repentance: Peter and the People in Luke's Passion Narrative**

The role of the Jews in Luke-Acts has been much debated in recent literature, yet despite everything that has been written it continues to challenge scholars of the New Testament. The focus of this particular investigation is the presentation of the people in Luke's passion narrative, particularly Jesus' trial before Pilate.

Joseph Tyson has undertaken part of this investigation. He examines Luke's use of the literary device of Jewish crowds in light of the literary pattern of initial acceptance and final rejection<sup>(1)</sup>. This pattern, according to Tyson, is found in the overall structure of both Luke-Acts as a whole as well as each individual book<sup>(2)</sup>. Because the pattern, found in the gospel, of initial acceptance by the people followed by final rejection is repeated in Acts, Tyson labels it an "apparent inconsistency"<sup>(3)</sup>. He concludes that by the end of Acts

Jewish acceptance of Jesus and the early Christians has been either neglected or suppressed. The Jewish public has heard but rejected the gospel. Thus, the failed mission to the Jews is terminated in favour of the mission to the Gentiles<sup>(4)</sup>.

While there is no denying that the Christian community turned to the Gentile world in its later expansion Tyson's analysis of the crowds in Luke-Acts is unsatisfactory. The pattern of initial acceptance and final rejection in the gospel is not repeated in Acts in quite the same way as it is in the gospel. In the gospel the rejection by the crowds seems to include everyone as everyone calls for Jesus' death (23,18-25). But a careful analysis of the passion narrative, a crucial point in the entire two-volume work, suggests that this rejection is neither final nor complete. The people who call for Jesus' death do not participate in his crucifixion and in the early

(1) J. TYSON, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts", *NTS* 30 (1984) 574-583.

(2) *Ibid.*, 577.

(3) *Ibid.*, 581.

(4) *Ibid.*, 582.

chapters of Acts many of the people repent of their deed and embrace the emerging community of faith.

By the end of Acts the message of the Christian community is rejected by many of the Jewish people; this time it is final. Yet there is no indication that it is complete — that those Jews who initially accepted the message and repented now reject it. On the contrary, it is a group led by the Jewish leaders that remains skeptical or antagonistic to the Christian community throughout its growth.

Returning to Luke's passion narrative, one may note that there are three groups which may bear responsibility for Jesus' death, either alone or in concert with others: the Romans, the Jewish religious leaders, and the Jewish people. Any attempt to map out scholarly positions quickly reveals that not only do scholars differ as to which group bears responsibility, they also give nuanced accounts of that responsibility and how it functions within Luke-Acts<sup>(5)</sup>.

(<sup>5</sup>) The positions of some scholars involved in the debate can be divided into broad categories which, while they do not adequately reflect all of the nuances present, do help to clarify the dominant positions within the debate: 1. *Restriction of Blame to the Jewish Leaders Alone*: J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke*, (AB 28-28A; Garden City, NY 1981; 1985) 1488-1489; M. A. POWELL, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study", *JBL* 109 (1990) 91-110. 2. *Extension of Blame to Others*: (a) *Extension to the People and Maintenance of their Guilt*: J. T. SANDERS, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London 1987) esp. 37-83; J. T. SANDERS, "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts", *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. J. B. TYSON) (Minneapolis 1988) 51-75; J. B. TYSON, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, SC 1986); D. P. MOESSNER, "The 'Leaven of the Pharisees' and 'This Generation': Israel's Rejection of Jesus According to Luke", *JSNT* 34 (1988) 21-46; J. NEYREY, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology* (New York 1984); I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1978); E. E. ELLIS, *The Gospel of Luke* (London 1974); R. MADDOX, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh 1982); J. BLINZLER, *The Trial of Jesus* (Westminster, MD 1959); L. GASTON, "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative in Luke and Acts", *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, vol. 1: *Paul and the Gospels* (ed. P. RICHARSON-D. GRANSKOU) (Waterloo 1986) 127-153. (b) *Extension to the People and Mitigation of Guilt*: (i) *Through a Division within Israel*: J. JERVELL, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis 1972) esp. 41-74; G. LOHFINK, *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (StANT 39; München 1975); D. L. TIEDE, "'Glory to Thy People, Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews", *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (ed. J. NEUSNER et al.) (Philadelphia 1988) 327-341; R. L. BRAWLEY, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta

Such diversity calls for a re-examination of the evidence of Luke-Acts, especially the passion account.

Such an examination reveals that Luke presents the Jewish religious leaders as bearing primary responsibility for Jesus' death. The Romans play a minor part, if any at all, in putting Jesus to death<sup>(6)</sup>. Luke clearly keeps the people from being implicated in the responsibility for Jesus' death, save for one instance, that of their calling for Pilate to crucify Jesus (23,13-23). Until this point the people are presented as responding favourably to Jesus' ministry in a controlled and organized manner. There is no threat of insurrection or riot. Luke 23,13-23 serves to place guilt on the people but only so that they can be presented as repenting of that deed and becoming part of the growing Christian community, first through their act of contrition (23,48) and later in the early chapters of the book of Acts.

That Luke would have his readers understand the actions of the people this way is underlined by the deliberate resemblance of the call of the people for the death of Jesus (23,13-23) and Peter's denial of Jesus (22,54-62). Just as Peter repents of his action and takes on a position of leadership, so too are the people given the opportunity to repent of their actions and become part of the growing community. Thus Luke's narrative suggests that the people's rejection of Jesus was short-lived, similar to Peter's rejection.

---

1987); H. CONZELMANN, *The Theology of St. Luke* (Philadelphia 1960); J. KODELL, "Luke's Use of *Laos*, 'People', especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19,28-24,53)", *CBQ* 31 (1969) 327-343. (ii) *Through Repentance*: R.J. KARRIS, *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature* (New York 1985); R.E. BROWN, "The Passion According to Luke", *Worship* 66 (1986) 2-9; J.D. KINGSBURY, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis 1991). (iii) *Through Ignorance*: F.J. MATERA, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories* (New York 1986); H. HENDRICKX, *The Passion Narratives of the Synoptic Gospels* (London 1984); J.T. CARROLL, "Luke's Crucifixion Scene", *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus* (ed. D.D. SYLVA) (Frankfurt am Main 1990). (iv) *Through Tragic Misjudgment*: R.C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia 1986); R.C. TANNEHILL, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story", *JBL* 104 (1985) 69-85.

<sup>(6)</sup> Cf. CONZELMANN, *Theology*, 138-144, who argues that Luke has a political apologetic in his presentation of the passion narrative.

### I. The Role of the "Crowd" in Jesus' Arrest

Luke's account of the passion narrative opens with the plot to arrest Jesus (22,1-6). In Luke's account the chief priests and the scribes are afraid of the influence and popularity that Jesus commands among the people (22,2; cf. 19,48; 20,1-8.19). In order to avoid a confrontation with the people Judas arranges to betray Jesus in the absence of a crowd (*ochlos*, 22,6). The reference to the *ochlos* here should be understood by the preceding reference — the people (22,2) who, presumably, are favourable to Jesus<sup>(7)</sup>.

Despite the fears of the Jewish leaders an *ochlos* is present at Jesus' arrest (22,47-55). However, the nature of the "crowd" is qualified by Luke's addition in v. 52<sup>(8)</sup>. When Jesus addresses the crowd he delineates who makes up the crowd — the chief priests, the elders, and the captains of the temple (the legal arm of the Jewish leadership). Of course, one would expect that these men would have their own supporters with them, as is evidenced by the presence of the high priest's slave. But *ochlos* cannot logically refer to a group which is broader than this as it would be in contradiction to the religious leaders' desire to act without the knowledge of the people/crowd (22,2.6)<sup>(9)</sup>. Since Luke was careful enough to add these references in vv. 2 and 6, it is not probable that he should envision the "crowd" of v. 47 being any broader than the reference in v. 52 would indicate.

In Luke's account the only beating Jesus receives occurs before his trial before the Sanhedrin (22,66-71). Luke has removed Mark's description of the abuse Jesus receives at the hand of Pilate and the Roman soldiers (Mark 15,15-20)<sup>(10)</sup>. Again this seems to be done to

<sup>(7)</sup> Luke uses *ochlos*, *ochloi*, and *laos* interchangeably in his gospel, which is reflected here. For example, in recounting the feeding of the five thousand (9,10-17) Luke uses *ochloi* (v. 11), *ochlos* (v. 12, 16), and *laos* (v. 13) to refer to the same group. Cf. also the "sermon on the plain", esp. 6,17.19; 7,1.

<sup>(8)</sup> C.F. EVANS, *Saint Luke* (Philadelphia 1990) 819; A. PLUMMER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1901) 513.

<sup>(9)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1449; SANDERS, *Jews*, 219-20. For the opposite view see GASTON, "Anti-Judaism", 145; TYSON, *Death*, 37.

<sup>(10)</sup> The two-source hypothesis will be assumed throughout this paper and the question of sources other than Mark for Luke's account will not be addressed.

heighten the guilt of the Jewish leaders and lessen the involvement of the Roman authorities.

The morning after Jesus' arrest the elders of the people (*presbyterion tou laou*, 22,66) question him. The mention of the people here does not implicate the whole people along with the authorities. Luke usually distinguishes the people by mentioning them separately<sup>(11)</sup>. Some scholars see this group as representing all Israel<sup>(12)</sup>. But since they do not seem to be representative throughout the gospel it seems unlikely that they would be so now, especially in light of the religious leaders' fear of the *laos*<sup>(13)</sup>. The people who have been favourably disposed towards Jesus throughout Luke's gospel are not yet presented as being aware of the proceedings against Jesus or being supportive of those proceedings.

Afterwards, the whole Sanhedrin (*hapan to plēthos autōn*)<sup>(14)</sup> took Jesus before Pilate and brought forth their charge against him (23,1-5). Pilate questions Jesus briefly before addressing the chief priests and the multitudes (*ochloi*). Some commentators understand the *ochloi* here to be a large group of the people of Jerusalem as well as pilgrims to the city<sup>(15)</sup>. But, as with the arrest scene, the context of a passage must determine who is present. Luke still has not mentioned the arrival of any group other than the religious leaders and, presumably, the larger group that was associated with them. Thus the *ochloi* is the same group that arrested Jesus<sup>(16)</sup>. If it was comprised of a broader group of people, then in bringing forth the charge that Jesus "stirs up the people" (23,5) this group implicates

<sup>(11)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1466.

<sup>(12)</sup> NEYREY, *Passion*, 71; cf. KARRIS, *Artist*, 89.

<sup>(13)</sup> For a discussion of various opinions and a defence of the position that Luke differentiates between Jewish leaders and the people at large see BRAWLEY, *Conflict*, 133-154. Also see H. STRATHMANN, "*Laos*", *TDNT* VI, 51; cf. EVANS, *Luke*, 834.

<sup>(14)</sup> Cf. Acts 23,7 where *plēthos* is also used to refer to the members of the Sanhedrin. See G. DELLING, "*plēthos, plēthynō*", *TDNT* VI, 279. *Hapan* ("all") should probably be understood as hyperbole in light of the later reference to Joseph of Arimathea, who was a member of the Sanhedrin but did not consent to the plan to have Jesus put to death (23,50-51).

<sup>(15)</sup> MARSHALL, *Luke*, 853; HENDRICKX, *Passion Narratives*, 81; NEYREY, *Passion*, 76; ELLIS, *Luke*, 264; EVANS, *Luke*, 848 (although he suggests that their presence is not feasible); A. BÜCHELE, *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23* (Frankfurt am Main 1990) 27.

<sup>(16)</sup> Cf. note 7, above, on Luke's interchange of *ochlos*, *ochloi*, and *laos*.

itself in unlawful activity. It is unlikely that Luke would have the people implicate themselves in such a way.

The chief priests and the scribes accompany Jesus to Herod in order to make clear the charges that were being brought against him and to "vehemently accuse" him (*eutonōs katēgorountes*, 23,10)<sup>(17)</sup>. Luke may have included this for two reasons: to prevent his readers from thinking that Pilate sent his own representatives to recount the charges before Herod and to remind his readers again that it is the Jewish leaders who are concerned to have Jesus convicted of a crime<sup>(18)</sup>.

## II. The Call of the People for Jesus' Death

Pilate's reconvening of the trial of Jesus is the first appearance of the people (*laos*) in Luke's passion narrative (23,13-16). It seems that Luke is concerned to have representatives of different strata of society within Israel present when Pilate makes his declaration of Jesus' innocence<sup>(19)</sup>. Rau suggests that the inclusion of the people in this passage contradicts Luke's previous tendency to differentiate them from their leaders<sup>(20)</sup>. Thus he conjectures an original *archontas tou laou* which has inadvertently been changed to *archontas kai ton laon* by a scribe. Unfortunately this creative conjecture lacks any manuscript support<sup>(21)</sup>. It is further contradicted by accusations of the guilt of the people in Jesus' death in Acts<sup>(22)</sup>.

(17) Cf. Mark 15,4 which Luke seems to have intensified as well as moving the scene to the trial before Herod.

(18) In Luke's narrative the Pharisees have been involved in Jesus' ministry throughout. However, after Jesus enters Jerusalem the Pharisees no longer play a part in the story. The Jewish leaders who oppose Jesus in Jerusalem are the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders.

(19) BÜCHELE, *Tod*, 34. NEYREY, *Passion*, 80-81, is incorrect in asserting that it is the same audience composition as the other trials. He concludes, "Luke has suggested the broadest possible Jewish representation of the Jews in keeping with his interest in presenting Israel's formal rejection of God's prophet" (81). Cf. D. SENIOR, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (Wilmington, DE 1989) 116-117. That the *laos* here are not the same as the *ochlos* of the arresting party (22,52; 23,4) is suggested by 23,27 where a multitude of the *laos* are said to be following those leading Jesus away to crucifixion.

(20) G. RAU, "Das Volk in der lukanischen Passionsgeschichte; ein Konjektur zu Luke 23:13", *ZNW* 56 (1965) 41-51.

(21) MARSHALL, *Luke*, 858; but see KODELL, "Jerusalem Narrative", 332, n. 22.

(22) Cf. R. F. ZEHLE, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and*

Pilate summarizes the charges brought against Jesus by combining the two main charges of vv. 2 and 5 — “Perverting the people” (*apostrephonta ton laon*, 23,14). He declares that neither he nor Herod has found Jesus guilty of any charges. The verb *katēgoreō* (“accuse”) is in the second person plural. It does not refer to all in the group that Pilate called together in v. 13 because the group did not consist only of those who accused Jesus. In the two previous uses of this verb (23,2.10) it is the religious leaders who are doing the accusing. Thus while Pilate is speaking in the presence of a group that includes the people (*laos*) he is addressing the religious leaders (Jesus’ accusers) directly<sup>(23)</sup>.

In the next scene there is a call from all concerned for the death of Jesus (23,18-25). In Mark’s account he writes of the customary release of one prisoner during the Passover (Mark 15,6)<sup>(24)</sup>. Luke’s omission of this aspect of Mark’s account eliminates any sense of Pilate fulfilling an obligation to the religious leaders and the people<sup>(25)</sup>. The cry for the release of Barabbas, a man who clearly poses a threat to Roman rule, underlines the unjust treatment of Jesus.

Luke’s omission of the actions of the chief priests stirring up the crowd (Mark 15,11) places the responsibility for the calling for Jesus’ crucifixion clearly on the entire group that is before Pilate: “but they all cried out together” (*anekragon de pamlēthi legontes*, 23,18). Since the makeup of this group has been established in v. 13 it is clear that the people (*laos*) are no longer mere spectators but are now involved in the events that result in Jesus’ death, as is shown by the use of the adverb *pamlēthi*<sup>(26)</sup>.

---

*Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter’s Speeches of Acts 2 and 3* (SBLMS 15; Nashville 1971) 64, n. 12. The people are implicated in Jesus’ death in only a few instances, primarily in the early preaching of Peter in Jerusalem: Acts 2,23.36; 3,14-18; 4,27; cf. 10,39; 13,27-28.

<sup>(23)</sup> *Contra* BÜCHELE, *Tod*, 34 and 36, n. 82.

<sup>(24)</sup> Some manuscripts include v. 17 in Luke which notes that it was necessary for Pilate to release a Jewish criminal at the feast of Passover. However, it is more probable that it is a later scribal insertion. See B. M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London – New York 1971) 179-180.

<sup>(25)</sup> In fact, it is unclear that there was such a practice. See J. S. KLOPPENBORG, “*Exitus clari viri*: The Death of Jesus in Luke”, *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8 (1992) 117, n. 8.

<sup>(26)</sup> This is the only use of the adverb *pamlēthai* in the New Testament. It is rare even in other Greek literature of the time; see BAGD, 607;

Luke wants his readers to envision the entire group involved in the following activity<sup>(27)</sup>. This seems like a strange reversal of allegiance on the part of the people.

### III. Rejection by Peter and the People

The immediate question that confronts the reader when Luke 23,18-23 is read is why Luke introduces the people into the situation at all. Throughout his gospel, even in the passion narrative thus far, Luke has been careful to indicate that the people were not in any way in opposition to Jesus. In light of this it is difficult to agree with many commentators who suggest this passage evidences the ultimate rejection of Jesus by Israel and the justification for the Gentile mission that will be described in Acts<sup>(28)</sup>.

---

LSJ, 1294. Both BAGD (607) and LSJ (1294) list only one other use of this adverb – Dio Cassius 75.9.1. BAGD suggests that it translates “all together” while LSJ suggests “with the whole multitude”. A more clear rendering of Luke 23,18 might be “they, that is, those who brought the charges against Jesus [cf. 14b], cried out and with them the whole multitude, that is the *laos* who are with them [cf. 13]”. B.J. CHANCE, “The Jewish People and the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts: Some Implications of an Inconsistent Narrative Role”, *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers* (ed. E.H. LOVERING, Jr.) (SBLASP 30; Atlanta 1991) 55-57, esp. n.17, hints that *pamplēthei*, which is possibly derived from *pas* and *plēthos* (cf. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1489), refers back to *hapan to plēthos* (23,1). This latter verse he understands to refer to the chief priests and elders alone, as we have also argued above. Thus Chance maintains that the people are not involved in the shouting. But *plēthos* occurs again immediately after the scene before Pilate, and there it clearly refers to the people, not the Jewish leaders: *poly plēthos tou laou* (23,27). This supports our argument that *pamplēthei* introduces the people into the action of shouting.

(<sup>27</sup>) So MARSHALL, *Luke*, 860; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1489; SANDERS, *Jews*, 225; TANNEHILL, *Luke*, 164; BÜCHELE, *Tod*, 36; G. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3/1-2; Gütersloh 1977) 477. CHANCE, “Jewish People” 56-59, argues that those involved in the calling out for Jesus’ death are the Jewish leaders alone — “the text can only be read sensibly to indicate that the leaders are the subjects of the third person plural verbs” in vv.18, 21, and 23 (p. 57). But, as he admits, this then leaves the reader with the problem of why the people, if they have not turned against Jesus, did not rise up to protect and defend him, as the Jewish leaders feared they would (22,2). Nor does Chance adequately account for the charges of involvement in the death of Jesus made against the people in the speeches in Acts, except to posit an “inconsistent narrative role”.

(<sup>28</sup>) See footnote 5, above.



The answer to the puzzle may lie in looking at how Luke treats Peter. Like the people, Peter also denied allegiance to Jesus (22,54-62). In fact, the similarities between Luke's account of Peter's denials and the account of the shouting of the crowd are striking<sup>(29)</sup>. Peter is accused of association with Jesus three times. Each time that he protests against the accusation he denies the association more strongly. When the people are before Pilate they too exhibit an intensity of response. At each of Pilate's three declarations that Jesus was undeserving of death the people clamoured more intensely for Jesus' death.

As we shall see below, the comparison of the account of Peter's denials with the call for Jesus' crucifixion helps the reader to see more clearly why the people become involved in Jesus' condemnation in Luke's gospel. Such a comparison is invited by the common use of triads in Luke's gospel. For example, there are three temptations, three passion predictions, and three trials (before the Sanhedrin, Pilate, and Herod). In each of these cases the issue at hand becomes more intense with each element of the triad; the temptations become more enticing, the passion predictions become more elaborate, and the trials become more complex. The comparison of these two pericopae is also encouraged by the fact that both involve a denial of Jesus. Peter clearly denies Jesus (*arneomai*, 22,57). In the gospel the people are not explicitly said to be denying Jesus when they call out for his crucifixion, but their actions clearly reveal that they are; they are refusing to align themselves with Jesus any longer. Later, in Acts 3,13-14, the verb *arneomai* is twice used of these actions:

The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified his servant Jesus, whom you [*laos*, vv. 11 and 12] delivered up and denied (*ērnēsasthe*) in the presence of Pilate, when he had decided to release him. But you denied (*ērnēsasthe*) the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted to you....

A closer examination of the account of Peter's denial and the account of the call for Jesus' crucifixion reveals the similarities. In the first instance Peter responds to an indirect accusation of association with Jesus by denying all knowledge of Jesus (*ouk oida*

<sup>(29)</sup> On the deliberate paralleling of material by Luke see C.H. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula 1974) esp. 16-55.

*auton*, 22,57). In the trial account Pilate announces that the charges against Jesus were not just cause for his death. In response the crowd shouts (*anekragon de*) for Pilate to keep Jesus and release Barabbas (23,18). The ignominy of the situation is increased by Luke's note that, in contrast to Jesus, Barabbas was involved in an insurrection in Jerusalem and was a murderer, thus a threat to the Romans.

In the second instance Peter is directly accused of being a follower of Jesus. He answers directly, declaring: "Sir, I am not" (*anthrōpe, ouk eimi*, 22,58). His response is short and clear. So also was the second response of the crowd. Pilate is said to have called to them expressing his desire to release Jesus. In response they were shouting (*hoi de epephōnoun*): "Crucify, crucify him!" (*staurou staurou auton*, 23,21).

In both cases the intensity of the response increases again in the third instance. Both passages include a reference to the giving of evidence to support the initial claim that is made, although the respondents ignore that evidence. Peter is accused a third time by a man who emphatically insists (*diischyrizeto*) that he is sure (*ep' alētheias*) that Peter was with Jesus, because Peter is a Galilean (22,59). Peter denies the accusation and ignores the evidence, yet he offers no evidence to the contrary (*anthrōpe, ouk oida ho legeis*, 22,60). When Pilate addresses the crowd for the third time he asks them for evidence of any crime being committed by Jesus, because he has found none. Yet the crowd does not respond to Pilate's challenge to produce evidence. Rather, like Peter, they ignore the evidence and pursue their desire more urgently (*hoi de epikeinto*), demanding with loud cries (*phōnais megalais aitoumenoi*) that he should be crucified (23,23). Finally, Pilate gives in to mob pressure (*kai katischuon hai phōnai autōn*, 23,23) and surrenders Jesus to the will of those seeking Jesus' death (23,24-25).

Noting the similarities between Peter's denial of Jesus and the call of the crowd for the crucifixion of Jesus nuances the understanding of this pericope. The main focus is not just on Pilate and his proclamations. Of vital significance is the people's denial of Jesus. Luke is highlighting the failure of the people to continue to align themselves with Jesus when he most needs support.

#### IV. The Rehabilitation of the People

Before Peter's denial, Luke records Jesus' words of encouragement to him: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail;

and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren" (22,32). Implicit in this is Peter's failing, but there is also the element of faith that will cause Peter to turn again and support the Christian community<sup>(30)</sup>. This begins with Peter's bitter weeping outside the courtyard (Luke 22,62) and is borne out in the early chapters of Acts where Peter becomes the leader of the growing community in Jerusalem.

If one understands the threefold shout of the crowd for the crucifixion of Jesus to be similar to the account of Peter's denials then one would expect that the crowd should also go through an experience of repentance and of strengthening in the Christian faith. And, indeed, this occurs. Immediately after the narrative of Luke 23,18-23 the people begin to be separated once again from the religious leaders. Finally, after witnessing Jesus' death, they express contrition and repentance for their involvement (23,48). This continues in the early chapters of Acts when the people, convicted of their own guilt in the death of Jesus, embrace the gospel message in large numbers (Acts 3,9-4,4; cf. 2,12-41).

In Acts 2 Peter addresses a crowd (*plēthos*, Acts 2,6) which has gathered to observe the Pentecost manifestations of the Holy Spirit. In the course of his sermon he accuses his entire audience of participating in the death of Jesus (Acts 2,23). He concludes his sermon by again pointing to the guilt of the entire nation in the death of Jesus (Acts 2,36). When the multitude hear this they are "cut to the heart" (Acts 2,37) and about three thousand of them follow Peter's injunction to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2,38). Thus, having participated in the condemnation of Jesus they now repent of their deed and become adherents of the growing movement of his followers. Without their participation in the condemnation of Jesus they would have nothing of which to repent<sup>(31)</sup>.

<sup>(30)</sup> See S. BROWN, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome 1969) 69-71; "[Peter's] sin will be a sin of cowardice but not a loss of faith" (70). Cf. S. BROWN, "Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke", *The Bible Today* 63 (1972) 988-989. One might also note that Luke has weakened the expressions found in Mark's account (Mark 14,66-72) and omitted the curse; H. MERKEL, "Peter's Curse", *The Trial of Jesus* (ed. E. Bammel) (London 1970) 66.

<sup>(31)</sup> F. MATERA, "Responsibility for the Death of Jesus According to the Acts of the Apostles", *JSNT* 39 (1990) 79, suggests, "The missionary discourses of Acts accuse the audience of the greatest misdeed (the death of

After the healing of a crippled beggar (Acts 3,1-8) Peter again confronts his audience (*laos*, Acts 3,11) with their deed. He declares that the healing of the beggar glorifies Jesus whom they denied before Pilate (Acts 3,13-15). He goes on to suggest that the people and their rulers acted in ignorance (Acts 3,17)<sup>(32)</sup>, giving everyone involved in Jesus' crucifixion, people and rulers, the opportunity for repentance (Acts 3,19). However, Luke soon makes it clear that it is only the people who take advantage of the opportunity. The Jewish rulers are presented as being annoyed at the apostles and they eventually put them in jail (Acts 4,1-3). In contrast to this reaction, a large number from among "those who heard the word" (that is, the *laos*) joined the newly forming Christian community (Acts 4,4). Thus, the people and the rulers are again separated in their responses to Jesus and the early Christian community.

The fact that the speeches in Acts are constructed (by Luke)<sup>(33)</sup> so as to bring about the repentance of the audience may be understood as the reason why Luke involves the people in the call to crucify Jesus<sup>(34)</sup>. However, he does this in a way which does not detract from the primary involvement of the religious leaders and clearly shows the people to be undergoing an experience similar to that of the apostle Peter. It also allows an implicit comparison between the people, who are repentant, and the Jewish leaders, who are hostile to Jesus and Rome. Thus Luke is not here presenting

---

the Messiah) in order to effect conversion". He argues in his article that Luke has framed the majority of the texts where the Jews are accused of killing Jesus "within missionary discourses where their primary function is to summon people to repentance" (89); see further 78-86. Cf. R.C. TANNEHILL, "The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts", *NTS* 37 (1991) 403, n. 12, cf. 405-406.

<sup>(32)</sup> While 3,17 does not use *laos*, Peter addresses his audience as "brothers" (*adelphoi*). However, the audience clearly is composed of the people (3,9-12, where *laos* occurs three times). Although all the Jews are implicated in the death of Jesus throughout the speeches in Acts three factors mitigate the implication of guilt: they acted in ignorance, they acted in accordance with God's will, and they are given the opportunity for repentance. GASTON, "Anti-Judaism", 128-130.

<sup>(33)</sup> See E. SCHWEIZER, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts", *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L. E. KECK-J. L. MARTYN) (Nashville 1966) 208-212.

<sup>(34)</sup> Luke may also be using this narrative technique to deal with the historical problem that confronts him — the actual participation of the people in Jesus' death.

Israel as rejecting Jesus<sup>(35)</sup>. The narrative become the means whereby the people of Israel come to accept the message of salvation of the early Christian community<sup>(36)</sup>.

### V. Who Crucified Jesus ?

In Luke's passion narrative the description of Jesus being led to his crucifixion is ambiguous. Since 23,25 suggests that Pilate delivers Jesus to the will of those who desire to have him crucified (*pared-oken tō thelēmati autōn*), then those who lead him (*kai hōs apēgagon auton*, 23,26) should be understood to be that group<sup>(37)</sup>. The reference in 23,27 to a large group of the people (*poly plēthos tou laou kai gynaikōn*)<sup>(38)</sup> following Jesus leaves one group to do the leading — the religious leaders. The *poly plēthos tou laou* here could be understood as being in contrast to the *plēthos* of 23,1, the religious leaders, who led Jesus to Pilate. Hence, Luke separates the people from their leaders again<sup>(39)</sup>.

The question is not whether the Sanhedrin or any Jewish rulers after Alexander Janneus employed crucifixion, they probably did not<sup>(40)</sup>. Moreover, it is not a question of whether the Sanhedrin lacked the right of execution as the Fourth gospel suggests (John

<sup>(35)</sup> Thus NEYREY, *Passion*, 83, is incorrect in asserting that by unjustly condemning Jesus Israel is here bringing down God's judgement on itself.

<sup>(36)</sup> MATERA, *Passion Narratives*, 171, suggests that Luke's wider theology lessens the guilt of Peter and the apostles (cf. 22,55-62). The same could be suggested here for the *laos*; see KODELL, "Jerusalem Narrative", 343.

<sup>(37)</sup> BROWN, "Passion", 7; P. W. WALASKAY, 'And so we came to Rome': *The Political Perspective of St. Luke* (SNTSMS 49; Cambridge 1983) 44-45. The obscurity of the language may be explained by the fact that Luke has omitted the mocking by the soldiers and attributed it to the temple guards earlier in chapter 22. This suggests again that he wants to remove the possibility of understanding Roman involvement in Jesus' crucifixion. Cf. MATERA, *Passion Narratives*, 181, suggests that Luke purposely leaves the text ambiguous to heighten the responsibility of the Jews; cf. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1496.

<sup>(38)</sup> For a suggestion as to why Luke distinguishes these groups see NEYREY, *Passion*, 109.

<sup>(39)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1497.

<sup>(40)</sup> E. BAMMEL, "Crucifixion as a Punishment in Palestine", *The Trial of Jesus* (ed. E. BAMMEL) (London 1970) 162-165 argues that the Jews used this form of punishment in Palestine from as early as the second century BCE. But see M. HENGEL, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Cross* (Philadelphia 1977) 84-85.

18,31). The question is rather what Luke's *audience* might reasonably assume. Crucifixion was in fact carried out by local leaders elsewhere in the Roman Empire<sup>(41)</sup>. And Luke understands the Jewish leaders to be capable of sanctioning some type of capital punishment, as is shown through his presentation of the stoning of Stephen (Acts 6,15–7,1; 7,54–60)<sup>(42)</sup>. According to Luke, Pilate permitted the Sanhedrin to crucify in the instance of Jesus, whether or not it was standard practice in all instances<sup>(43)</sup>.

Jesus' prayer for the forgiveness of those who are crucifying him (23,34) is a major textual problem in Luke's passion narrative<sup>(44)</sup>. However, the concept of forgiveness occurs many times in the Gospel (e.g., 5,20; 7,47–48; 17,3–4) and Jesus' forgiveness of those who were involved in his crucifixion is not out of keeping with Luke's wider presentation. The issue is, are the "they" — in terms of the narrator — the Romans or the Jewish officials. Stylistically, v.34 coheres with the statements in Acts which focus on Jewish involvement. In one telling passage Peter suggests that the *people*, and the *rulers* (cf. 23,13), put Jesus to death in ignorance: *oida hoti kata agnoian epraxate, hōsper kai hoi archontes hymōn* (Acts 3,17). This echoes Jesus' statement in 23,34 *ou gar oidasin ti poiousin*. Thus, this verse most probably comes from the hand of Luke himself and underlines the involvement of the Jewish officials and people in Jesus' crucifixion.

While the prayer for clemency treats the people and the leaders together, Luke immediately moves to distinguish the two. Unlike Mark's account of the people passing by and deriding Jesus, in Luke the people (*laos*) merely stand by in order to witness

<sup>(41)</sup> HENGEL, *Crucifixion*, 69–83; cf. EVANS, *Luke*, 841–842.

<sup>(42)</sup> However, this spontaneous action does not show that they had legal authority to impose and execute capital punishment. Again the issue is not whether they did or did not have the legal right, but whether Luke's audience would think so. The same issue arises with respect to the execution of James (Acts 12,1–2). Josephus (*Ant.* 20.9.1, §201) indicates that there was a legal problem involved, but one cannot assume that Luke's audience knows Josephus.

<sup>(43)</sup> Such an understanding is present also in Acts 2,23–24.36; 4,10; 5,30; 10,39. P. WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus* (ed. by T.A. BURKILL–G. VERMES) (Berlin <sup>2</sup>1974) 109, concludes that before the year 70 CE the Sanhedrin had the authority to carry out sentences of death.

<sup>(44)</sup> See METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 180, for a discussion of the evidence. He concludes that it is from the hands of unknown copyists.

Jesus' death <sup>(45)</sup>. This may be an allusion to the Septuagint text of Ps 21,8a, but Luke has changed it <sup>(46)</sup> so that only the rulers mock Jesus <sup>(47)</sup>. The *de* in this verse is adversative, clearly separating the action of the rulers from that of the people <sup>(48)</sup>.

The soldiers who mock Jesus with the offering of vinegar to drink (from Mark 15,36) and by challenging Jesus to save himself are often thought to be Roman soldiers <sup>(49)</sup>. But it need not necessarily be understood this way. Throughout Luke's passion narrative mention has been made of only two groups of soldiers, the Temple guard and Herod's soldiers. It is unlikely that Luke's readers should understand the soldiers here to be Herod's. But in light of Luke's editorial work it would not be unusual to understand these soldiers as the Temple guard and not Roman soldiers <sup>(50)</sup>. If the reference is to Roman soldiers they appear quite suddenly and seem only to have been involved in the mockery of Jesus, not his being led away.

After Jesus dies a centurion declares that Jesus was innocent (*dikaïos*, 23,47) <sup>(51)</sup>. This has been taken to suggest that the Romans were involved in crucifying Jesus <sup>(52)</sup>. Yet nothing in Luke's narrative requires that the centurion was connected with Jesus' execution <sup>(53)</sup>. Unlike the people, he can praise God without remorse or repentance because he has not been involved in the death of one

<sup>(45)</sup> In Codex Bezae (D) the words of the rulers are put into the mouths of the people. This is typical of Bezae, which heightens the role of the people in the passion narrative of Luke. See G. E. RICE, "The Role of the Populace in the Passion Narrative of Luke in Codex Bezae", *AUSS* 19 (1981) 147-153.

<sup>(46)</sup> That this passage is linked to Psalm 21,8a (LXX) is suggested by the verbs *theōreō* ("see") and *ekmuktēpizō* ("ridicule"). Mark uses Psalm 21,8b. MARSHALL, *Luke*, 868.

<sup>(47)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1504.

<sup>(48)</sup> EVANS, *Luke*, 869.

<sup>(49)</sup> FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1505. He suggests that "It reflects a historical detail even though Luke has sought to play down their involvement and presence". EVANS, *Luke*, 870.

<sup>(50)</sup> So WALASKAY, *Perspective*, 45; SANDERS, *Jews*, 11.

<sup>(51)</sup> For a strong argument that *dikaïos* is best rendered "righteous" see R. J. KARRIS, "Luke 23:47 and the Lucan view of Jesus' Death", *JBL* 105 (1986) 65-74. Cf. MATERA, *Passion Narratives*, 187.

<sup>(52)</sup> I.e., MARSHALL, *Luke*, 874; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1519.

<sup>(53)</sup> When the Roman army had details such as a crucifixion half of the eight men who made up a contubernium were used. There was no need for a centurion (the commander of ten contubernia) to be present. See J. L.

who was *dikaios*. Thus he stands in contrast to the people<sup>(54)</sup>. The centurion is put forth as a witness to what has taken place, not as a participant in the proceedings. The declaration of the Roman centurion along with that of the Roman governor bracket Jesus' death with statements that Jesus was not deserving of death<sup>(55)</sup>.

According to Luke the people (*ochloi*) also seem to recognize that Jesus was *dikaios*, thus undeserving of death<sup>(56)</sup>. They return to their homes "beating their breasts" (*typtontes ta stēthē*, 23,48). This is a clear sign of grief over wrongdoing and of repentance<sup>(57)</sup>. The same action expresses the grief and repentance of the tax-collector in the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector (18,9-14). There the repentant sinner returns to his house having been justified (*dedikaiōmenos*, 18,14)<sup>(58)</sup>. This parable occurs in Luke's narrative shortly before Jesus enters the Temple in Jerusalem. Thus, the imagery would have been fresh in the minds of his audience when they encounter the action of the people here. Like Peter who expresses remorse for his denial (22,62) the people express remorse for their rejection of Jesus.

### Conclusion

It needs to be stressed that one should not confuse Luke's presentation of responsibility with what may have in fact happened sixty or seventy years prior to Luke. Luke's audience — or some of

---

JONES, "The Roman Army", *The Catacombs and the Colosseum: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity* (ed. S. BENKO-J.J. O'ROURKE) (London – Valley Forge 1971) 193-194.

<sup>(54)</sup> Elsewhere in Luke-Acts centurions are portrayed in a positive way, having a good relationship to the Jewish people (Luke 7,4-5; Acts 10,1-2.22), approaching Jesus with respect (Luke 7,1-10), and treating the apostles well (Acts 21,32-40; 22,25-29; 23,16-30; 27,43).

<sup>(55)</sup> BROWN, "Passion", 8. For the argument that the centurion's confession should be seen in light of other Greco-Roman literature, specifically the post-mortem pronouncements that are made at the death of someone who is executed and give a summary of their life, see KLOPPENBORG, "Exitus", 113.

<sup>(56)</sup> Again *ochloi* is used as a synonym for *laos* (cf. note 7, above). Luke gives no indication that the Jewish leaders express repentance.

<sup>(57)</sup> TANNEHILL, *Luke*, 166; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 1520; BÜCHELE, *Tod*, 55. Several witnesses include interpolations to heighten the account; see METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 182.

<sup>(58)</sup> Compare also Josephus' description of King David expressing guilt and contrition over the death of Absalom (*Ant.* 7.10.5, §252).



them — presumably had access to the Marcan passion narrative account and thus would know another version of the death of Jesus. Yet Luke, who confessedly wrote to set several matters straight (Luke 1,1-4), presents the passion story in such a way as to show that primary responsibility for Jesus' death belongs to the Jewish religious leaders. As he presents it, the Romans have at most an ambiguous, and at least, a negligible, role to play: Pilate declares Jesus innocent, and then hands Jesus over to the Jewish religious leaders. Likewise, the people are kept clear of involvement until the final scene before Pilate, when they suddenly display a reversal of allegiance and call out for Jesus' death. Almost as quickly as Luke involves them, however, he begins to separate them again. Finally, after witnessing Jesus' death, the people repent of their involvement. When one notes the similarities between this account and Peter's denial of Jesus and subsequent repentance and leadership in the church, one can see that Luke uses the people's rejection of Jesus to prepare the way for the repentance and conversion of many of the people in the book of Acts<sup>(59)</sup>.

1519-30 Charles St. W.  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M4Y 1R5

Richard S. ASCOUGH

## SOMMAIRE

Dans le récit lucanien de la Passion, le peuple juif ne joue un rôle actif qu'à un seul moment, lorsqu'il demande la mort de Jésus dans la scène du jugement devant Pilate (23,18-25). Ce changement d'attitude peu caractéristique, à ce moment du récit, ressemble étrangement au reniement de Jésus par Pierre (22,54-62). Cependant, de même que Pierre se repent de sa faute et prend ensuite une part active à la conduite de la communauté chrétienne, de même le peuple se repent et se joint à la communauté qui ne cesse de grandir. Ce fait suggère que Luc a délibérément voulu présenter le peuple de cette façon pour expliquer la croissance du mouvement chrétien dans les premiers chapitres des Actes. En même temps, Luc montre que les autorités religieuses juives sont les premières responsables de la mort de Jésus, et non les autorités romaines.

(59) My thanks to John S. Kloppenborg for his careful reading and helpful critique of this paper.

## **Those Who “Pass Judgment”: The Identity of the Opponents in Colossians \***

The question of the identity of the opponents in view in Colossians has been debated for over a century with little movement toward a consensus<sup>(1)</sup>. Some have even argued that there were no opponents in view<sup>(2)</sup>. Some of the disagreement stems from the different methods used to identify opponents. These methods usually are not examined carefully<sup>(3)</sup> and thus are often defective. This writer has recently suggested a method for identifying opponents in Paul's letters<sup>(4)</sup>. This study will apply that method to Col to determine what is opposed there. The purpose of this study is not to propose a completely unique position on these opponents but to identify them on the basis of an explicit method and to establish a view about them on as firm a basis as possible.

This method focuses on the primary text itself, strictly limiting what parallels outside the letter can contribute. We will make two types of judgments about statements in the letter. The first evaluates

\* The research for this project was made possible by a James Still Fellowship sponsored by the Andrew Mellon Foundation through the University of Kentucky's Faculty Scholars Program.

(<sup>1</sup>) See the summary of forty-four different hypotheses about the opponents in Col J.J. GUNTHER, *St. Paul's Opponents: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings* (NTS 35; Leiden 1973) 3-4. Cf. the examples of studies of these opponents in F.O. FRANCIS-W.A. MEEKS, eds., *Conflict at Colossae; A Program in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies* (Sources for Biblical Study 4; Missoula 1973).

(<sup>2</sup>) M. HOOKER, "Were there False Teachers in Colossae?," *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament* (ed. B. LINDARS-S. S. SMALLEY) (Cambridge 1973) 315-331. She is followed by N.T. WRIGHT, "Poetry and Theology in Col 1:15-20", *NTS* 36 (1990) 463-464.

(<sup>3</sup>) One exception to this absence of attention to method is F.O. FRANCIS, "The Christological Argument of Colossians", *God's Christ and His People* (eds. J. JERVELL-W.A. MEEKS) (Oslo 1977) 192-194.

(<sup>4</sup>) J.L. SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents; The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (JSNTSS 40; Sheffield 1990) 75-120.

how certain we can be that a statement actually refers to opponents. The second concerns how reliable that statement is, i.e. how much distortion is present in it. To establish these two judgments, we must distinguish between explicit statements about opponents, allusions to them, and affirmations, i.e. statements or teachings which do not explicitly mention or obviously allude to opponents but may address them.

Additionally, we must distinguish between types of contexts. For example, we should expect more references to opponents in a polemical section than in a didactic section or a thanksgiving period. Further, statements made in a polemical context will likely contain more distortion than those in didactic contexts<sup>(5)</sup>. According to our method, allusions to opponents can be identified only on the basis of issues brought up in explicit statements. Then, we determine which affirmations address the opponents on the basis of what we find in explicit statements and allusions. Finally, this method calls for us to begin with the clearer statements and move to the more difficult, interpreting the latter in accordance with what we find in the former<sup>(6)</sup>.

### Explicit Statements

#### 2,16

We begin our search for the opponents of Col with the fairly clear explicit statement in 2,16. There is almost universal agreement that 2,16-23 is polemical<sup>(7)</sup>. In a polemical section we should expect not only direct opposition to opponents, but also damaging judgments and exaggerated claims about them<sup>(8)</sup>.

<sup>(5)</sup> For a complete discussion of various types of statements in different kinds of contexts see SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 95-113.

<sup>(6)</sup> Ibid., 119.

<sup>(7)</sup> Those who identify 2,16ff. as a distinct section and identify it as polemical include M. DIBELIUS-H. GREEVEN, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament; Tübingen <sup>3</sup>1953) 29; H. CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", *Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8; Göttingen 1962) 131; E. LOHSE, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1971) 114; P. T. O'BRIEN, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC 44; Waco 1982) 136, 138, 155.

<sup>(8)</sup> For discussion of these features of a polemical section see SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 97, 212-213, n. 2.

In 2,16 the author, whom we will refer to as Paul<sup>(9)</sup>, warns the Colossians not to let anyone judge them with respect to food, drink, or particular holy days<sup>(10)</sup>. Interpreters generally agree that these food regulations are ascetic (cf. 2,22). The holy days mentioned include new moons and Sabbaths, celebrations derived from Judaism<sup>(11)</sup>. But this does not necessarily indicate that Col opposes Judaizers<sup>(12)</sup>.

2,16 shows that Paul believes the Colossians need to be warned against allowing themselves to be judged on the basis of their compliance with a regimen of food regulations and the observance of certain holy days.

## 2,4

In 2,4, our next explicit statement, Paul warns the Colossians not to let anyone deceive them with good sounding arguments<sup>(13)</sup>. This statement occurs in the section composed of 1,24–2,5<sup>(14)</sup>, which seems to be apologetic because Paul is establishing his authority over the Colossian community in preparation for his attack on the opponents<sup>(15)</sup>.

(9) No view on the authenticity of Col is taken in this study. But for convenience, the author will often be referred to as Paul.

(10) Some argue that the indefinite τις (T. K. ABBOTT, *The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* [ICC; Edinburgh 1897] 263; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 114) or the present imperative (O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 138) shows that there is a real threat to the Colossian community.

(11) This is generally accepted for the Sabbath. For discussion of the new moon in Hellenistic Judaism see T. C. G. THORNTON, "Jewish New Moon festivals, Galatians 4:3-11 and Colossians 2:16", *JTS NS* 40 (1989) 97-100.

(12) So E. SCHWEIZER, *The Letter to the Colossians; A Commentary*, trans. A. Chester (Minneapolis 1982) 157; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 115; "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians", *NTS* 15 (1968) 212; F. F. BRUCE, "Colossian Problems Part 3: The Colossian Heresy", *BSac* 141 (1984) 197.

(13) Most interpreters recognize 2,4 as a statement about the opponents. However, HOOKER, "Were there False Teachers", 317, sees it as a general warning.

(14) Most commentators divide the text this way, e.g. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 1; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 68; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, LIV.

(15) Others who see this as an apologetic section include LOHSE, *Colossians*, 68 and MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 69. Similarly, SCHWEIZER,

2,4 is an evaluation of the opponents—they deceive with good sounding arguments. It may yield a bit more information since it begins with τοῦτο λέγω which points to the preceding statements. We will comment on 2,2-3 as an allusion below.

## 2,19

2,19, another polemical evaluation of the opponents<sup>(16)</sup>, says that they have separated themselves from Christ. No doubt the opponents would have vigorously disputed this evaluation. Given its function, this verse probably contains none of the opponents' vocabulary or concepts<sup>(17)</sup>. It shows only that Paul believes the opponents' views have the gravest of consequences.

## 2,20-23

2,20-23 also explicitly addresses the Colossian situation. These verses conclude the polemical section, 2,16-23. Since v. 20b indicates that some Colossians are submitting to the regulations in v. 21<sup>(18)</sup>, Paul is not simply warning them in advance, there are opponents in Colossae advocating these views<sup>(19)</sup>.

V. 20a sets out a presupposition of Paul's opposition to the opponents in vv. 21-22. That the Colossians died with Christ to the στοιχεῖα, who are involved with living according to the δόγματα of the world, is not in dispute. Both Paul and the Colossians accept

---

*Colossians*, 115 and J. GEWIESS, "Die apologetische Methode des Apostels Paulus im Kampf gegen die Irrlehre in Kolossä", *Bibel und Leben* 3 (1962) 265.

<sup>(16)</sup> So also O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 136, 141.

<sup>(17)</sup> *Contra* DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 36, who sees σῶμα as a reference to the ἄρχαι and ἐξουσίαι and so to the στοιχεῖα. Instead, the image of head and body may simply echo 1,15-20. Perhaps SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 163, is correct that the body is the church, but it seems as likely that it is simply a use of the metaphor.

<sup>(18)</sup> Those who see a rebuke in v. 20b seem to hold this view. E.g. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 90; R.P. MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon* (NCB; London 1974) 90; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 137. However, HOOKER, "Were there False Teachers?", 317-318, sees v. 20b as a general warning. But her comments on v. 21 somewhat negate the force of this assertion (*ibid.*, 328).

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. LOHSE, *Colossians*, 123.

this<sup>(20)</sup>. What Paul must point out is that their death with Christ means that they need not heed the opponents' demands. We will say more about the στοιχεῖα below in connection with 2,8.

The three "don'ts" of v.21 are examples of the types of regulations the opponents impose and are either quotations<sup>(21)</sup> of the opponents or irony and caricature<sup>(22)</sup>. In either case, v.21 shows that the opponents call for some type of abstinence.

Both v.20b and v.22 contain Paul's polemical evaluations of the opponents' rules<sup>(23)</sup>. In v.20b he stated that they were equivalent to living in the world, which he opposes to having died with Christ. In v.22 he says that the opponents' commands or the objects these commands involve are of no lasting value<sup>(24)</sup>. He judges "all such things" to be according to the commands and teachings of humans. Ἐντολή and διδασκαλία are not *Stichworte* of the opponents, first because they are part of Paul's critical judgment on their regulations and second because Isa 29,3 determined the form of the expression<sup>(25)</sup>.

Syntactical problems make even translating v.23 difficult<sup>(26)</sup> but the main point is clear. Paul is rejecting the opponents' teachings, saying that they are without value and lead to indulgence of the

(20) So E. PERCY, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* (Lund 1946) 167; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 201-202. E. SCHWEIZER, "Die 'Elemente der Welt' Gal 4:3,9; Kol 2:8,20", *Verborum Veritas* (eds. O. BÖCHER-K. HAACKER) (Wuppertal 1970) 247, argues that "died to the στοιχεῖα" is more like the expressions "died to sin" and "died to the Law" than like a reference to spiritual powers in the narrow sense.

(21) So MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 96; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 137; F.O. FRANCIS, "Visionary Discipline and Scriptural Tradition at Colossae", *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 2 (1967) 73.

(22) See LOHSE, *Colossians*, 123. Cf. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 273; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 137, 149-150.

(23) So PERCY, *Probleme*, 139; GEWIESS, "Die apologetische Methode", 269; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 194; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 124.

(24) O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 137, 150, identifies this as a criticism of the opponents.

(25) Many recognize this allusion to Isaiah, including C.F.D. MOULE, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Cambridge Greek New Testament Commentary; Cambridge 1957) 151; FRANCIS, "Visionary Discipline", 73; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 124; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 151.

(26) On translating this verse see B. HOLLENBACH, "Col 2:23: Which things Lead to the Fulfilment of the Flesh", *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 255-261.

flesh or are without value against the indulgence of the flesh<sup>(27)</sup>. This polemical evaluation of the opponents' views<sup>(28)</sup> follows the pattern present in 2,21-22 of listing the sorts of demands the opponents make (v.21) and then giving an evaluation beginning with a relative pronoun (in v.22 ἃ) followed by ἐστιν. This construction is also found in 2,17 (see below). V.23 begins with the relative pronoun ἃτινα followed by ἐστιν. That this construction introduces a negative evaluation of the opponents' teaching is made clear in v.23 by the use of λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας<sup>(29)</sup>. Some see this phrase as evidence that the opponents call their teaching wisdom<sup>(30)</sup>. However, given the respect accorded asceticism as a manifestation of wisdom in the first century, it is probably a more general statement which says only that they appear to be wise.

The expressions ἐθελοθρησκία, ταπεινοφροσύνη, and ἀφειδία σώματος all describe the opponents' practices. The question is, are they descriptions the opponents themselves use or descriptions the author assigns? Since these things give the opponents' teaching its reputation for wisdom, the Colossians see them positively. So the opponents probably used the terms. That humility and severity to the body were seen as wise is clear enough, but that self-chosen or voluntarily accepted worship shows wisdom is not as obvious to twentieth-century readers. Thus some see it as a negative evaluation, meaning something like alleged piety<sup>(31)</sup>. But since it is probably one of the opponents' slogans<sup>(32)</sup>, the point is that they have taken

(27) This latter understanding is that of MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 108; PERCY, *Probleme*, 139; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 169.

(28) Others who see polemical elements here include W. BIEDER, *Die kolossische Irrlehre und die Kirche von heute* (Theologische Studien 33; Zürich 1952) 9-10; PERCY, *Probleme*, 169; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 126; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 137; W. SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", *The New Testament and Gnosis* (eds. A. H. B. LOGAN-A. J. M. WEDDERBURN) (Edinburgh 1983) 117; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 168.

(29) SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 168.

(30) Those who see this term as a slogan of the opponents include LOHSE, *Colossians*, 126 and SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", 117.

(31) So BIEDER, *Die kolossische Irrlehre*, 9-10 and SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", 117. Cf. MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 15.

(32) M. DIBELIUS, "The Isis Initiation in Apuleius and Related Initiatory Rites", *Conflict in Colossae*, 89; BORNKAMM, "The Heresy of

on a burden beyond that of ordinary Christians which makes them superior.

Ἀφειδία σώματος is a general enough expression that it need not have been a slogan, though the opponents may have used it at times to describe their manner of life. It seems more likely that they use ταπεινοφροσύνη in some specialized sense, as we will see in connection with 2,18. No other terms in v.23 echo the opponents' terminology<sup>(33)</sup>.

Vv. 20-22 show that the opponents' teachings are at least mildly ascetic and, according to Paul, incompatible with Christian existence. All we see about the στοιχεῖα is that they are done away with in baptism<sup>(34)</sup> and are involved with δόγματα of non-Christian (ἐν κόσμῳ) existence. We see from v.23 that the opponents may refer to their teaching as wisdom and describe their practice as severity to the body. They more likely use the terms ἐθελοθρησκία and ταπεινοφροσύνη in their teaching.

## 2,17

2,17 is another explicit statement about the opponents in the polemical section 2,16-23. This verse says that the opponents' regulations about food, drink, and holy days are a "shadow of things to come, but the reality is the body of Christ"<sup>(35)</sup>.

---

Colossians", *Conflict in Colossae*, 134; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 126; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 153.

<sup>(33)</sup> *Contra* LOHSE, *Colossians*, 126, who sees both τιμῇ and πλησμονή as reflections of the opponents' language, but this requires too extensive a use of mirror exegesis. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 276, understands πλησμονή to mean "excessive indulgence" and sees it opposed to asceticism.

<sup>(34)</sup> FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 197, sees 2,20 as a baptismal tradition.

<sup>(35)</sup> Some see a quotation of the opponents in v.17; others specify whether σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to what Christ did on earth (e.g. H. C. G. MOULE, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* [The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge 1898] 110) or the church (e.g. MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 91), or see a reference to the Hebrew Scriptures in the σκία (e.g. G. B. CAIRD, *Paul's Letters from Prison* [New Clarendon Bible; Oxford 1976] 162; E. SCHWEIZER, "Christianity of the Circumcised and Judaism of the Uncircumcised; The Background of Matthew and Colossians", *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* [eds. R. HAMERTON-KELLY-R. SCROGGS] [Leiden 1976] 257).



The form of 2,21-22 should guide our interpretation of 2,17. 2,16 contains a sample of the opponents' demands. V. 17 begins ἃ ἔστιν, just as v. 22 does. This parallel construction suggests that v. 17 is the same type of statement as v. 22, i.e. an evaluation. So v. 17 is probably not using the opponents' language, it is simply Paul's evaluation of their regulations—they are transitory in comparison with "the body of Christ" <sup>(36)</sup>.

Such detrimental evaluations reveal nothing specific about one's opponents but should not surprise us given the nature of polemic in the Hellenistic period.

2,8

2,8, our next explicit statement, appears in the polemical section 2,6-15 <sup>(37)</sup>. Paul warns the Colossians in 2,8 not to be despoiled by philosophy and vain deceit which is according to human tradition and the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and not κατὰ Χριστόν. This is another polemical evaluation <sup>(38)</sup>. Still, many interpreters find quotations of the opponents here, e.g. the term "philosophy" <sup>(39)</sup>. Even if this is correct, we cannot characterize the opponents' theology on the basis of this term, as some do <sup>(40)</sup>, because it had a wide range of meanings in this period and was used by many religious groups <sup>(41)</sup>.

<sup>(36)</sup> Σῶμα may simply complete the comparison with σκία. So O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 139-141.

<sup>(37)</sup> Interpreters are divided over whether the section begins at v. 6 or v. 8 or even at v. 4, but all see the section to which v. 8 belongs as polemical.

<sup>(38)</sup> So FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 194; GEWIESS, "Die apologetische Methode", 268; CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 142. LOHSE, *Colossians*, 94, supports this view by pointing to the βλέπετε which often begins an admonition. Cf. SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", 112.

<sup>(39)</sup> E.g. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 246; BORNKAMM, "The Heresy of Colossians", 126; DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 27; BIEDER, *Die kolossische Irrlehre*, 13; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 95; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 109; R. YATES, "Christ and the Powers of Evil in Colossians", *Studia Biblica 1978: III Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (JSNTSS 3; Sheffield 1980) 462; A.M. MOYO, "The Colossian Heresy in the Light of Some Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi", *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 48 (1984) 36.

<sup>(40)</sup> E.g. MOULE, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 101; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 206; and LOHSE, *Colossians*, 95.

<sup>(41)</sup> O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 109. It may simply parallel 'vain deceit' and so be a criticism of the opponents, as C.F.D. MOULE proposes (*Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 90).

Some also see the term "tradition" as a slogan of the opponents<sup>(42)</sup>. Others believe "tradition of humans" combats their claim to a superhuman source of teaching<sup>(43)</sup>. Both of these interpretations are based on a mirror reading of the text. This method is far too unreliable to use without limitations beyond those present here<sup>(44)</sup>. "Human tradition" is probably a general polemical evaluation of the opponents' teaching<sup>(45)</sup>, especially in light of the next phrase, to which we now turn.

One of the more difficult expressions in Col is στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. In 2,8 this phrase stands parallel with the preceding ("tradition of humans") and following ("not according to Christ") phrases<sup>(46)</sup>. All three are evaluations of the opponents' views<sup>(47)</sup>. The point of all three is that "the opponents' teaching is at variance with Christian teaching"<sup>(48)</sup>.

The στοιχεῖα appear twice in explicit statements about the opponents, here as a negative evaluation of their teaching generally and in 2,20 as the foundation for rejecting their regulations. So, there is no indication that the στοιχεῖα play a part in the opponents' teachings. In fact, the evidence suggests that they did not because, in both places they occur, Paul *assumes* that a relationship with them is bad and that this assumption needs no support<sup>(49)</sup>. In 2,8 involvement with them is a polemical accusation rather than a citation of their language.

While it is doubtful that στοιχεῖα was used by the opponents, we need to consider its meaning because other features of their views

<sup>(42)</sup> E.g. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 27; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 96; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 110.

<sup>(43)</sup> E.g. BIEDER, *Die kolossische Irrlehre*, 14.

<sup>(44)</sup> See SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 98-100 for comments on the use of mirror exegesis.

<sup>(45)</sup> Similarly FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 202 and C.A. EVANS, "The Colossian Mystics", *Bib* 63 (1982) 202.

<sup>(46)</sup> So PERCY, *Probleme*, 166-167; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 202; SCHWEIZER, "Die Elemente", 246.

<sup>(47)</sup> So PERCY, *Probleme*, 166-167; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 202, 206. This is perhaps a change in Francis's position from his "Visionary Discipline", 79, where he identified κατὰ Χριστόν as a claim of the opponents.

<sup>(48)</sup> FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 202.

<sup>(49)</sup> Cf. PERCY, *Probleme*, 156-167; FRANCIS, "Christological Argument", 206.

may warrant reconsidering this judgment. Though the στοιχεῖα have been identified many ways<sup>(50)</sup>, the philological evidence clearly favors identifying them as the elements—earth, water, air, and fire<sup>(51)</sup>, as even some who disagree with this identification admit<sup>(52)</sup>. Understanding the στοιχεῖα as a reference to the four (perhaps personified)<sup>(53)</sup> elements, the phrase means something rather general like worldly teaching. Accusing the opponents of having their teaching derive from the στοιχεῖα (whether it means the elements or spiritual beings) is a good example of the type of polemical exaggeration we often find in Col<sup>(54)</sup>.

2,18

2,18, our last explicit statement, is a warning. Paul exhorts the Colossians not to be condemned or robbed of their place by the opponents. Since this is the second warning about allowing themselves to be judged, it is clear that the opponents are passing judgment<sup>(55)</sup> on the basis of ascetic practices and holy days (2,16) and the things mentioned here in 2,18<sup>(56)</sup>.

<sup>(50)</sup> For a review of some interpretations see SCHWEIZER, "Die Elemente", 247ff. and id., "Zur neuen Forschung am Kolosserbrief (seit 1970)", *Theologische Berichte* 5 (1976) 173-176. Since 1976 see R. YATES, "Colossians and Gnosis", *JSNT* 27 (1986) 59.

<sup>(51)</sup> SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 128; id., "Die Elemente", 247ff.; id., "Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3 and Col 2:8, 18, 20", *JBL* 107 (1988) 455-466.

<sup>(52)</sup> A. T. LINCOLN, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge 1981) 114.

<sup>(53)</sup> These "elements" were being personified and venerated in the first century. See SCHWEIZER, "Die Elemente", 247f. and especially the references from Philo there.

<sup>(54)</sup> GEWIESS, "Die apologetische Methode", 264, points out that Col often presents the opponents in their most extreme form and perhaps draws consequences from their teaching which they did not surmise in order to present them in the worst light possible.

<sup>(55)</sup> See DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 34; CAIRD, *Paul's Letters from Prison*, 162-163; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 117; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 136, 141; C. ROWLAND, "Apocalyptic Visions and the Exaltation of Christ in the Letter to the Colossians", *JSNT* 19 (1983) 74.

<sup>(56)</sup> O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 141-142.

"Α ἑώρακεν ἑμβατεύων<sup>(57)</sup> indicates that the opponents receive visionary experiences<sup>(58)</sup>, in which they see things which are significant for their teachings. The referent of ἃ is difficult to identify because it is a neuter plural following two feminine nouns. Rowland cites Col 3,6, where a list of feminine nouns is followed by a neuter plural relative which includes all of the nouns in the list, as a parallel construction<sup>(59)</sup>. Thus, 2,18 says that the opponents see humility and worship in their visions.

ἑμβατεύων has been discussed at length since Dibelius identified it as a term taken from the mysteries<sup>(60)</sup>. However, the evidence for this use of the term is a century later than Col. More contemporary evidence shows it to be a fairly general term meaning simply 'to enter'<sup>(61)</sup>. Jewish apocalyptic literature used it in connection with visionary ascent, but not as a technical term for entering the heavenly realm<sup>(62)</sup>. Given its general meaning and apocalyptic's use of that meaning, ἑμβατεύων probably had no special meaning for the opponents, though they may well have used it much the way Paul does here.

The first item Paul says they see in these visions is ταπεινοφροσύνη, which interpreters almost universally agree is a *Stichwort* of the opponents and a reference to ascetic practices, especially fasting<sup>(63)</sup>. This view is supported by the presence of ascetic regulations in the context (v.16), by the proximity of its mention here and in 2,23 with worship<sup>(64)</sup>, and by the fact that it is

(57) The previous phrase, θέλων ἐν, seems best understood as a Septuagintism for "to delight in". So MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 104; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118, n.29 and others.

(58) SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", 118-119.

(59) ROWLAND, "Apocalyptic Visions", 75-76.

(60) "Isis Initiation", 83-84.

(61) See F. O. FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18", *Studia Theologica* 16 (1962) 119ff.

(62) ROWLAND, "Apocalyptic Visions", 76. FRANCIS, "Humility", 119ff., is tempted to see it as a technical term of apocalyptic Judaism and he presses too much out of this term in "Visionary Discipline", 76.

(63) So e.g. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 35; CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 145; PERCY, *Probleme*, 148-149; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 158; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 117; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 141-142.

(64) LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118; LINCOLN, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 111.

seen in visions<sup>(65)</sup>. Since this humility is seen in the visions, τῶν ἀγγέλων probably modifies humility as well as worship<sup>(66)</sup>. So they see the humility of angels in their visions.

One of the most important and difficult expressions in Col is the “worship of angels”. The question is of course whether the genitive is objective (worship directed toward angels) or subjective (worship which angels perform). Whichever view is taken, interpreters agree that the opponents use the phrase θρησκειᾷ τῶν ἀγγέλων. Since τῶν ἀγγέλων probably modifies both humility and worship, they most likely also stand in the same relationship to it. That is, since the genitive is subjective in relation to humility, it is subjective in relation to worship. If we had evidence in explicit statements that the opponents venerated spiritual beings, it could override this grammatical consideration or force us to rethink the relationship between humility and τῶν ἀγγέλων. However, the only possible references to spiritual beings in explicit statements are the two mentions of the στοιχεῖα. Since neither of those passages describes the opponents’ teaching, there seems to be no connection between the στοιχεῖα and the angels of v.18<sup>(67)</sup>. Finding the genitive to be subjective is supported by the attention given to the “piety practiced by angels” in the Hellenistic world generally<sup>(68)</sup> and in Jewish writings in particular<sup>(69)</sup>.

2,18 shows that the opponents’ judgments against the Colossians are based on what they call angelic humility and angelic worship. This humility, which consists of their ascetic practices, is what they see and the practice they derive from their visions. They

(65) ROWLAND, “Apocalyptic Visions”, 75, cites humility as one thing seen in heavenly ascents in apocalyptic literature.

(66) O’BRIEN, *Colossians*, 142, notes that “humility” and “worship” are closely linked because they are joined by a single preposition.

(67) SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 158-159; “Slaves of the Elements”, 465, thinks that the Colossians worshipped angels, but also rejects identifying these angels with the στοιχεῖα.

(68) FRANCIS, “Visionary Discipline”, 77.

(69) See LINCOLN, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 112; ROWLAND, “Apocalyptic Visions”, 75. The argument that worship directed to angels would have produced a stronger polemic (e.g. EVANS, “The Colossian Mystics”, 196-197) is weak because it is an argument from silence. In addition, SCHWEIZER, “Die Elemente”, 247-249, has shown that some Jewish writers (e.g. Philo) distinguish between polytheism and the veneration of the στοιχεῖα.

also pride themselves on observing and perhaps participating in angelic worship. So ἐθελοθρησκία in 2,23 probably indicates that they participate in the angelic worship they observe in their visions<sup>(70)</sup>. They then criticize their fellows for not attaining such experiences. Paul calls such judgments the results of worldly arrogance.

### *Summary of Explicit Statements*

Explicit statements about the situation at Colossae indicate that these opponents are ascetic visionaries whose asceticism includes regulations about food and drink and the observance of holy days, including new moons and Sabbaths. The angelic humility they observe in their visions set the pattern for their ascetic manner of life, which gives them a reputation for wisdom. It is possible, though not probable, that they use the terms wisdom and philosophy to describe their teachings.

In their visions they also observe and probably participate in angelic worship. Thus they take on an additional burden of cultic practices and probably use the term ἐθελοθρησκία to describe them. These cultic practices may extend to recreating the angelic worship they see in their visions. Not only do they participate in these cultic practices, they pass judgment against those who do not, perhaps even criticizing them for not receiving visions. Finally, the author of Col says they present arguments for their views which sound convincing.

The author of Col levels many criticisms against these opponents. He calls their views human commands and teachings and so denies them a divine source. He calls their regulations transitory and says they effect the opposite of what they intend — instead of leading to restraint, they lead to indulgence of the flesh. Their teaching is further seen as incompatible with Christian baptism. The most devastating evaluations are that they have separated themselves from Christ and that their teachings are dogma of the world and κατὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and not according to Christ. These and other evaluations show how seriously Paul views their teachings.

<sup>(70)</sup> So also O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 143. *Contra* MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 94, and LOHSE, *Colossians*, 119, n.36, who think that ἐθελοθρησκία excludes the understanding of the "worship of angels" as a subjective genitive.

We may now search for allusions to the opponents on the basis of what we have seen about them in explicit statements.

### Allusions

#### 1,22-23

The most outstanding feature of Col 1 is the hymnic material in vv. 15-20. If we have correctly outlined the opponents' teaching, the material will in some way address them. 1,22-23 applies the material specifically to the Colossians<sup>(71)</sup>. The section in which these verses appear, 1,15-23<sup>(72)</sup>, is didactic, i.e. it presents teaching to make a point for its own sake and is neither directly polemical nor directly apologetic. Allusions in such contexts can only confirm or clarify a point we already know is under discussion.

The point of 1,22-23 is that the universal reconciliation wrought by Christ, which was the theme of the second half of the vv. 15-20, applies to the Colossians. V. 22 explains what that means: they now stand holy, blameless, and irreproachable before God. This is an allusion because we know the opponents are passing judgment against the Colossians. This passing of judgment seems to be one of Paul's main complaints against the opponents. 1,22 rejects the opponents' judgment against the Colossians.

V. 23 makes this safe and sure position of the ordinary Christian conditional, but not on ascetic regulations or visionary experiences. Rather, the condition is that they must remain firm in the teaching they had heard previously.

1,22-23 shows that the author's focus was on the opponents from the beginning of our letter. He uses 1,15-20 to show that the Colossians have a sure place before God while the opponents seem to claim that the Colossians lack this position.

It may be in order to direct some attention to 1,15-20 itself. Most interpreters think it was composed prior to Col<sup>(73)</sup> and find

<sup>(71)</sup> MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 58; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 62; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 64.

<sup>(72)</sup> So also MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 58f.; CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 62. While v.21 is a new beginning (so DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 21; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 62; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 64), this beginning serves only to mark the end of the hymnic material and the beginning of its application. The flow of thought is unbroken from v.20 to v.21.

<sup>(73)</sup> An exception to this is O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 40-42.

some additions by the Colossian author, e.g. “the church” to define the meaning of the body in v.18. Some see the list of spiritual powers in v.16 as an insertion which addresses the Colossian situation<sup>(74)</sup>. Other reconstructions of the original include this list of powers<sup>(75)</sup>. Given such uncertainty<sup>(76)</sup>, it seems best not to use this list of powers to identify the teaching of this letter’s opponents<sup>(77)</sup>. But even if we reject this caution, there is no evidence in explicit statements that these powers play a part in the opponents’ teachings. Thus we could not identify this list of beings as an allusion to the opponents’ teaching in any case.

### 2,2-3

The next allusion, 2,2-3, appears in the apologetic section 1,24-2,5. The first hint that this is an allusion is the τοῦτο λέγω of 2,4. This phrase probably refers to what has just preceded it<sup>(78)</sup>. The παρακληθῶσιν in v.2 points to vv.2-3 as the antecedent. This παρακληθῶσιν may be an irregular form of the παρακαλῶ exhortation found in Pauline and other letters of the era (e.g. those of Ignatius)<sup>(79)</sup>. If so, its function would be, at least in part, “to drive home the burden of the communication”<sup>(80)</sup>. Since a main purpose of Col is to refute the opponents’ teaching, vv. 2-3 are likely an allusion<sup>(81)</sup>.

<sup>(74)</sup> So e.g. J. M. ROBINSON, “A Formal Analysis of Colossians 1:15-20”, *JBL* 76 (1957) 284; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 61; MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 56.

<sup>(75)</sup> E.g. E. Bammel, “Versuch zu Col 1:15-20”, *ZNW* 52 (1961) 93; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 44-45.

<sup>(76)</sup> For a fairly extensive bibliography of the research on 1,15-20 see O’Brien, *Colossians*, 31-32.

<sup>(77)</sup> See also below the remarks about characteristics of christological hymns.

<sup>(78)</sup> LOHSE, *Colossians*, 83, n. 119, argues that the ἵνα shows that τοῦτο λέγω refers to the preceding.

<sup>(79)</sup> E.g. Phld 8.2. Since it serves this purpose in letters other than those of Paul, it may serve this function whether Col is Pauline or not.

<sup>(80)</sup> W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch; A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1985) 146.

<sup>(81)</sup> Even some who translate παρακληθῶσιν “encouraged” see in it an element of warning (LOHSE, *Colossians*, 80, n. 99; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 116). O’Brien, *Colossians*, 92-93, sees the main thrust of the word to be a warning. Even though it is an allusion, we cannot use mirror exegesis to identify terms or precise concepts of the opponents. *Contra* Gewies, “Die



2,2-3 says that the divine mysteries are in Christ. This seems to oppose claims about knowledge of heavenly matters gained through visions. If so, the opponents' plausible arguments mentioned in v.4 include claims that their teaching comes from their heavenly ascents. Such an argument not only seems weighty on the surface, it is also quite difficult to refute.

### *3,1-2 and 1,9-10*

Both 3,1-2 and 1,9-10 seem to be allusions to the opponents. But since neither passage yields new information about them, we will not explore them except to say that in both Paul seems to be defining the Christian life in contrast to their teachings. In 3,1-2 Paul redefines seeking the "things above" as living the ethical life set out in 3,5ff. 1,9-10 is one of the few places in Col where the realized aspect of the Colossians' Christian existence is not emphasized. There is room for attaining something beyond what they already possess in these verses. Paul specifies that the result of attaining more knowledge of God is bearing fruit in good works. This stands in contrast to the opponents' claim that visions are the result of knowledge of God.

### *Summary of Allusions*

Allusions confirm that the opponents claim spiritual knowledge from their visionary experiences. They then use this source, which they claim is divine, as a powerful tool in arguing for their views. They also condemn and see as sinners Christians who fail to live according to their regulations.

## Affirmations

### *2,9-10*

We now turn to affirmations which seem to address the opponents. Affirmations in polemical contexts can only clarify the op-

---

apologetische Methode", 269, who sees "all treasures of wisdom and knowledge" as a phrase taken over from the opponents. Similarly A.J. BANDSTRA, "Did the Colossian Errorists Need a Mediator?" *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (eds. R.N. LONGENECKER-M.C. TENNEY) (Grand Rapids 1974) 340. Cf. EVANS, "The Colossian Mystics", 200-201.

ponents' positions on issues we already know they raise. In apologetic contexts affirmations must tie directly to a point we know the opponents raise and can only extend such a point in a direction we have already seen them go<sup>(82)</sup>.

Our first affirmation appears in the polemical section 2,6-15. 2,9-10 addresses the opponents because we know that they pass judgment on the basis of their superior spirituality. 2,9-10 asserts that the Colossians are already complete; they need no other spiritual experiences. Many see a reference to the opponents here and identify the "fulness" mentioned as one of their slogans<sup>(83)</sup>. While the term reflects their mentality, there is no evidence that they use it in some special sense<sup>(84)</sup>.

According to v.9 the Colossians are to reject the opponents' teachings because everything, "all the fulness", is in Christ<sup>(85)</sup>. V.9 supports the assertions of both v.8 that the opponents' teachings are not κατὰ Χριστόν<sup>(86)</sup> and v.10 that the Colossians participate in this fullness. Thus, they do not need the opponents' regulations or spiritual experiences.

V. 10b further defines the status of Christ, calling him the head of all ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. Since we found insufficient evidence to show that veneration of spiritual beings was a problem at Colossae, we cannot assert from this affirmation that it was<sup>(87)</sup>. Mention of these beings is better explained as an echo of 1,15-20<sup>(88)</sup>.

<sup>(82)</sup> See SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 98-100, 102-103, 105.

<sup>(83)</sup> E.g. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 29; BORNKAMM, "The Heresy of Colossians", 124; MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 80-81.

<sup>(84)</sup> E. F. SCOTT, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (MNTC; New York 1930) 43-44, asserts that there is no hidden meaning in this language.

<sup>(85)</sup> We need not decide the precise meaning of σωματικῶς (v.9) to identify the opponents.

<sup>(86)</sup> So also O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 103.

<sup>(87)</sup> Nor is there any reason to identify them with the στοιχεῖα. *Contra* DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 29; BORNKAMM, "The Heresy of Colossians", 123; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 101; E. LEWIS, "Paul and the Perverters of Christianity", *Int* 2 (1948) 152-153.

<sup>(88)</sup> LOHSE, *Colossians*, 101 and O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 103, see this as an echo of this hymnic material. V. 10b may both take up the language of 1,15-20 and refer to the opponents' worship of these powers, as Lohse holds, but this seems unlikely for the reasons given above. See below our discussion of 2,15.

So in the face of the opponents' call for asceticism as a means to spiritual insight, Paul asserts here that the Colossians have attained fullness in Christ and need nothing else<sup>(89)</sup>.

### 2,13-15

Many interpreters recognize that 2,13-15 refers to the opponents, often finding some of their vocabulary in it. But explicit statements and allusions allow us to see it only as an affirmation which addresses them less directly. 2,11-15, a separate paragraph within the polemical section 2,8-15<sup>(90)</sup>, describes the fullness mentioned in vv. 9-10<sup>(91)</sup>. The affirmation of forgiveness in vv. 13-15 is an important counter to the opponents' judgment against the Colossians.

Several interpreters assert that the mention of circumcision in v. 13 (when combined with its mention in v. 11) indicates that the opponents require circumcision<sup>(92)</sup>. However, since there are no references to circumcision in statements which more clearly refer to their practices, we cannot identify it as such<sup>(93)</sup>. Paul is probably simply using a metaphor, as he does in 2,14ff.<sup>(94)</sup>.

V. 14 says that the χειρόγραφον τοῦ δόγματος which was against us was blotted out<sup>(95)</sup>. Many earlier interpreters identified

(89) So MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 94. Similarly O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 113, says that these verses affirm the presence of salvation among the Colossians.

(90) So DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 31; SCOTT, *Paul to the Colossians*, 44; MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 81. O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 13-15, and LOHSE, *Colossians*, 102; MARTIN, *Colossians*, 106, see vv. 13-15 as a separate paragraph.

(91) SCOTT, *Paul to the Colossians*, 44.

(92) E.g. SCOTT, *Paul to the Colossians*, 44; PERCY, *Probleme*, 140; LOHSE, *Colossians and Philemon*, 12; LINCOLN, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 113. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 30, leaves this as a possibility.

(93) H. WEISS, "The Law in the Epistle to the Colossians", *CBQ* 34 (1972) 309, n.63, raises the possibility that vv. 11-13a contain a confessional formula. DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 31, earlier noted the hymn-like character of vv. 9-12. If so, the language of circumcision is in the tradition rather than polemic against the opponents.

(94) So SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 142, 157. Others who deny that the opponents demand circumcision include ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 250 and SCHMITHALS, "The *Corpus Paulinum* and Gnosis", 118.

(95) Earlier interpreters often identified some part of this phrase with the Mosaic Law. E.g. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 255; DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 32; SCOTT, *Paul to the Colossians*, 46; PERCY, *Probleme*, 88ff.; CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 114.

one or more elements of the χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν with the Mosaic Law<sup>(96)</sup>. However, the χειρόγραφον refers to a statement of indebtedness in contemporary materials<sup>(97)</sup>, including Jewish literature<sup>(98)</sup>. The Apoc. of Elijah mentions one χειρόγραφον which contains a list of one's sins and another with a list of one's good deeds<sup>(99)</sup>. Thus this image of being indebted to God because of sins was current in the first century and is likely the meaning of the term here. Lohse suggests that the use of δογματίζω in 2,20 shows that the dogmas of v. 14 refer generally to the opponents' teachings<sup>(100)</sup>. Although this is possible, vv. 8-15 are not as directly polemical as the preceding verses and so it is less likely. Even if Lohse is correct, we learn nothing about the opponents from this very general statement. V. 14 does assert that additional regulations, and at least by implication the opponents' regulations, are invalid for Christians because they have received forgiveness through Christ's crucifixion.

In v. 15 ἄρχαι and ἐξουσίαι appear for the second time in affirmations. Since many see elements of a confessional formula in vv. 13c-15<sup>(101)</sup>, the appearance of these beings is explained by their presence in traditional material both here and in 2,10<sup>(102)</sup>. The presence of such powers in hymnic or confessional material should not surprise us. Hengel's analysis of hymnic material in the New Testament indicates that such material often deals with the signifi-

<sup>(96)</sup> E.g. ABBOTT, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 255; DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 32; SCOTT, *Paul to the Colossians*, 46; PERCY, *Probleme*, 88ff.; CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 114.

<sup>(97)</sup> See E. LOHSE, "Χειρόγραφον", *TDNT* 9, 435-436; id., *Colossians*, 108, especially n. 101; SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 148, especially n. 42.

<sup>(98)</sup> DIBELIUS-GREEVEN, *Kolosser*, 31; MARTIN, *Colossians and Phil-emon*, 84.

<sup>(99)</sup> LINCOLN, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 113.

<sup>(100)</sup> *Colossians*, 106-107. MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 84, also holds that δόγματα here refers to the opponents' teaching.

<sup>(101)</sup> E.g. LOHSE, *Colossians*, 106; O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 104. LOHSE, *Colossians*, 107, sees these beings as part of the confessional material quoted in these verses. Whatever δόγματα meant in the original confession, if it was a part of one, our context excludes seeing it as the Mosaic Law. Apart from mention of the Sabbath and new moons (which may have been honored for other reasons) there has been no indication that the opponents demand compliance with the Mosaic Code.

<sup>(102)</sup> We noted above that the mention of them in 2,10 seems to be an echo of the hymnic material in 1,15-20.

cance of Jesus' death "for universal salvation"<sup>(103)</sup> and that Christ's subsequent exaltation often includes reference to "the divine and worldly powers"<sup>(104)</sup>. Early hymns "continually 'narrated' and 'proclaimed' anew Christ's passion, glorification, and subjection of all powers"<sup>(105)</sup>. Since the motif of overcoming spiritual powers is commonly a part of hymnic material, nothing in the Colossian situation is needed to explain their presence in 1,16; 2,15, or the echo of 1,15-20 in 2,10.

2,13-15, then, reminds the Colossians of the forgiveness they have in Christ and perhaps stresses that this forgiveness includes freedom from the opponents' δόγματα. This passage confirms that the opponents assert that the Colossians are living in sin unless they submit to the opponents' regulations.

### 1,12-14

An affirmation within the thanksgiving<sup>(106)</sup> which seems to address the opponents is 1,12-14. Introducing the hymnic material<sup>(107)</sup>, vv. 12-14 assert, in the face of condemnation from the opponents, that the Colossians have received forgiveness. This assertion anticipates the message of universal reconciliation found in 1,15-20<sup>(108)</sup>. 1,12-14 addresses the opponents by dealing with forgiveness of sins in the face of their accusations of sinfulness. V. 12 asserts that the opponents' judgments are inappropriate because God has qualified the Colossians for his gifts.

<sup>(103)</sup> M. HENGEL, "Hymn and Christology", *Studia Biblica 1978: III; Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (JSNTSS 3; Sheffield 1980) 179.

<sup>(104)</sup> Ibid., 185. Here Hengel says, "Enthronement, authorization of the resurrected Christ and, at the same time, the homage of the divine and worldly powers, i.e. all of creation, belong to this exaltation complex".

<sup>(105)</sup> Ibid., 193.

<sup>(106)</sup> So CONZELMANN, "Der Brief an die Kolosser", 134; MOULE, *Epistles of Paul the Apostle*, 47ff.; especially O'BRIEN, *Colossians*, 18f., 25.

<sup>(107)</sup> LOHSE, *Colossians*, 32-33 and SCHWEIZER, *Colossians*, 45-47, make vv. 12-14 part of the section that contains the hymnic material and see it as a formal introduction to this material.

<sup>(108)</sup> See SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 107-108, on the use of affirmations in thanksgiving periods. Since these verses also introduce the hymnic material, we may allow them to supply more information about opponents than would otherwise be the case.

### *Summary of Affirmations*

Affirmations which address the opponents reinforce our belief that the opponents accuse the Colossians of sinning when they do not follow the prescribed regulations. They also confirm that one of Paul's main concerns is to remind the Colossians that God has already qualified them to participate in his blessings.

### Conclusion

We have found that Col addresses a community troubled by ascetic visionaries. Their asceticism includes food and drink regulations and the observance of certain holy days, including Sabbaths and new moons. These holy days suggest that they have drawn on Judaism for some aspects of their teachings, but there is no evidence that they demand circumcision or other commandments from Judaism beyond these holy days. In their visions the opponents observe and probably participate in angelic humility and angelic worship. These angelic practices are the model for their ascetic regulations and perhaps their self-imposed worship, their ἐθελοθησκία. They do not seem to have venerated spiritual beings or angels. The references to various spiritual beings are quotations of traditional material and accusations against the opponents.

The asceticism of these opponents is not the extreme type described by Lucian in *The Syrian Goddess*<sup>(109)</sup>. Rather, these opponents' moderate asceticism included food and abstinence regulations which may have been in effect only on the holy days mentioned or perhaps are intended to bring visions. In the ancient world, fasting and abstaining from various pleasures or comforts were often included among the preparations one went through to receive a vision. Fasting is often found in apocalyptic Judaism as a prelude to visionary experiences (e.g. 2 Baruch 12,5; 20,3-6; 47,2; 4 Ezra 5,50; 6,35; cf. 4 Ezra 9,24-27 where the abstinence is only from certain types of food). Paul does not reject these opponents because they live by a strict regimen, his complaint is that they bind these regulations on others and condemn those who do not live by

<sup>(109)</sup> This work is often cited by commentators to show the Colossians' familiarity with ascetic behavior and ecstatic cults.

them. They may also pass judgment against ordinary Christians for not having visions.

This passing of judgment is perhaps the main problem Paul has with these opponents. Allusions and affirmations show that their judgment goes beyond considering other Christians spiritually immature, it includes viewing them as sinners. The opponents claim to receive their teaching in their visions and so cite a divine, or at least heavenly, source for it. They then use this source as evidence for their views. It is possible that they use the terms 'philosophy' and 'wisdom' to describe their teaching, but these broad terms tell us nothing about them.

Criticism of these opponents permeates our letter. From the thanksgiving to the introduction of the hortatory section<sup>(110)</sup>, we find rebuttal of their views. Paul considers their error serious enough to charge that they have cut themselves off from Christ.

One criticism of the view that the opponents' teaching does not include veneration of angels is that it makes chapter 1 irrelevant to the discussion at Colossae. We have found this to be incorrect. The purpose of the hymnic material is to assure the Colossians of their place before God in Christ, especially of the forgiveness of their sins. This application fits the type of opponents we have described. Paul uses the hymnic material, not to establish the position of Christ, but to show that the Colossians' participation in Christ frees them from the opponents' regulations and charges of sinfulness.

Finally we must see if these opponents fit into any known groups of the first century. They are not Judaizers, even though they draw on some things within Judaism. Drawing on Judaism may have facilitated their reception since there had been Jewish communities in the region for at least two centuries<sup>(111)</sup> and it seems likely that this church would have included some Jews. There is no evidence that they are Gnostics, though like many groups of the first century they have elements that were later taken into Gnosticism.

<sup>(110)</sup> Our method allows us to use only explicit statements about opponents in hortatory sections. See SUMNEY, *Identifying Paul's Opponents*, 108-109. Since we cannot use possible allusions (e.g. 3,11) in such sections to identify the opponents, we have not discussed such passages in this study.

<sup>(111)</sup> See MARTIN, *Colossians and Philemon*, 3-4 and his citation of Josephus, *Ant.*, xii.147-153. Cf. the many commentators who cite Cicero, *Or.* 59 as evidence that there were at least 11,000 Jewish men in the region of Laodicea in the first century BCE.

Neither is there evidence that they are concerned with the ascent of the soul after death or have a mystery rite, as Schweizer contends.

The Colossian opponents were perhaps familiar with apocalyptic Judaism, but this is hardly unusual for early Christian communities. Some elements of the Colossian heresy are similar to those of apocalyptic Judaism, e.g. asceticism and attention to the worship seen in visions. But these elements are not unique to apocalyptic Judaism.

This study has tried to identify the Colossian opponents with a method that keeps us tied to the text. Rather than allowing other religious movements to be the basis for identifying allusions to opponents, the explicit statements made about them in Col itself have served as our guide. This approach has the virtue of allowing the text to speak as fully as possible. The view of the opponents presented here is perhaps not as detailed as some, but it is more certain because it is based throughout on the primary text. It can thus serve as a more secure basis for interpreting the letter.

Box 2432  
Ferrum College  
Ferrum, VA 24088-9001 USA

Jerry SUMNEY

## SOMMAIRE

Face à de nombreuses hypothèses contradictoires, cet article cherche à identifier les «adversaires» de l'épître aux Colossiens sur une base plus solide en utilisant une méthode proposée précédemment en vue d'identifier les «adversaires» dans d'autres épîtres pauliniennes. Le portrait des «adversaires» de l'épître aux Colossiens qui se dessine au terme de cette étude est celui de visionnaires ascétiques obtenant leurs visions au moyen d'une ascèse modérée. Ils ne vénèrent pas les anges, mais participent au culte angélique qu'ils contemplent dans leurs visions. La principale objection que l'auteur de l'épître aux Colossiens fait à ces visionnaires est qu'ils condamnent ceux qui ne cherchent pas et n'obtiennent pas de telles visions.



# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Rom 7,1-6: Lack of Imagination?

### Function of the Passage in the Argumentation of Rom 6,1-7,6

The difficulties of the passage under consideration are manifold. With regard to it one can hardly find a judgement as favorable as that of R. C. Lenski: "From the countless examples that offer themselves Paul selects one that serves his purpose best, for it is itself so clear and matches so well the spiritual reality which he wants to put into right light ... Paul's illustration is perfectly chosen" <sup>(1)</sup>. The overwhelming majority of commentators have an opinion exactly opposite, and the remark of C. H. Dodd, almost without reservation, could pass as emblematic for today's exegesis: "He [Paul] lacks the gift for sustained illustration of ideas through concrete images (though he is capable of a brief illuminating metaphor). It is probably a defect of imagination" <sup>(2)</sup>.

Obviously such a criticism is not based on our passage alone. An example, which has served as evidence of other possible shortcomings of Pauline analogies, is the famous allegory of the olive tree in Rom 11,17-24. For a long time many were content to point out the striking oddness of the image and to conclude that the apostle, born and educated in the city, had no knowledge of agriculture <sup>(3)</sup>. Only recently has the allegory come to be understood <sup>(4)</sup>. As far as our passage is concerned Joyce A. Little, in a short article which appeared in 1984, proposed an interpretation which, even if not completely satisfactory, not only does not have to do away with the analogy Paul uses, but has to start from it <sup>(5)</sup>. Both instances prove that it is possible to make Paul's images understandable and put in doubt the exactness of the exegetical procedures, which, when Paul's text appears difficult to understand, point to the inability of the author to sustain his

<sup>(1)</sup> R. C. R. LENSKI, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus, OH 1945) 743-744.

<sup>(2)</sup> C. H. DODD, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (New York-London 1932) 103.

<sup>(3)</sup> For a concise overview of the exegetical opinions cf. C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans II* (Edinburgh 1986) 565-566.

<sup>(4)</sup> The interpretation has been proposed by J.-N. ALETTI, *Comment Dieu est-il juste? Clefs pour interpréter l'épître aux Romains* (Paris 1991) 190-191.

<sup>(5)</sup> J. A. LITTLE, "Paul's Use of Analogy. A Structural Analysis of Rm 7:1-6", *CBQ* 46 (1984) 82-90. What seems to be lacking in Little's approach is the attention to the surface of the text itself, with the result that some correspondences between the analogy and its application are neglected or confused; secondly, there is an unwarranted presupposition regarding the link of the passage with the units which follow.

metaphor. Is it really a lack of imagination in Paul which makes his illustrations difficult, or rather do our presuppositions and our lack of attention both to the surface of the text and to the rhetorical models the Apostle uses in his argumentation prevent us from seeing his images from a correct perspective? This attention is what the present paper intends to follow, hoping for a result which allows a better understanding of the text, before which exegesis too often gives up the struggle.

*The Passage and Its Content – A First Investigation*

The division of chapters 6–7 of Rom has by now become common property. It is generally agreed that there are four or five short literary units: 6,1-14; 6,15-23; 7,1-6; 7,7-25 (or 7,7-12 and 7,13-25) with our passage in an intermediate position<sup>(6)</sup>. The agreement ends here, however, and an

	7,1-6	5,20-21	6,1-23	7,7-25
Ἦ ἀγνοεῖτε	v. 1		vv. 3 (16)	
γινώσκουσιν	v. 1		v. 6	vv. 7.15
νόμος	8 times	v. 20	vv. 14.15	15 times
κυριεύει	v. 1		vv. 9.14	
ἀνθρώπου	v. 1		v. 6	vv. 22.24
ζῆ	vv. 1.2.3	v. 21	vv. 2.10.11.13	v. 9
ἀποθάνη	vv. 2.3.6		vv. 2.7.8.9.10	v. 10
κατήργηται	vv. 2.6		v. 6	
ἐλευθέρα	v. 3		vv. 18.20.22	
τοῦ Χριστοῦ,	v. 4	v. 21	vv. 3.4.8.9.11.23	v. 25
ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι	v. 4		vv. 4.9.(13)	
καρποφορή- σωμεν	vv. 4.5		vv. 21.22 (καρπός)	
τῷ θεῷ	v. 4		vv. 10.11.13.17.22	
ὅτε-νυνὶ δὲ	vv. 5-6		vv. 20-22 cf. 19.21	
σαρκί	v. 5		v. 19	vv. 18.25
τὰ παθήματα			cf. v. 12 (ἐπιθυμία)	cf. vv. 7.8
τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν	v. 5	vv. 20.21		
μέλεσιν	v. 5		vv. 13.13.19.19	vv. 23.23
τῷ θανάτῳ	v. 5	v. 21	vv. 3.4.5.9.16.21.23	vv. 10.13.13.24
δουλεύειν	v. 6		vv. 6.16.17.20	v. 25
ἐν καινότητι	v. 6		v. 4	
παλαιότητι	v. 6		v. 6 (παλαιός)	

<sup>(6)</sup> The four literary units are seen by U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer (Röm 6-11)* (EKKNT VI/1; Neukirchen <sup>2</sup>1987); C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *Romans*; D. ZELLER, *Der Brief an die Römer* (RNT; Regensburg 1985); C. K. BARRETT, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Black's NT Commentaries; London 1984); five, by J. ZIESLER, *Paul's Letter to Romans* (London 1989) and E. KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans* (London 1982).

effort to put together single units into larger structures is a scholarly battleground, where the place of 7,1-6 is the major problem. For some commentators the passage concludes the section begun in 6,1, whereas for others it begins the macro-unit which continues to 7,25. Supporters of both opinions adduce as argument in their favor the lexical distribution, citing first of all the repetitions and/or omissions of vocabulary. Therefore, let us look at the situation from that point of view before there is any attempt to evaluate the proposals. The evidence which follows starts from the vocabulary of 7,1-6 and shows its correspondences to the other units.

As the above table shows from about forty auto-semantic words (i.e. articles, conjunctions and pronouns excluded) which appear in our passage, twenty-four are present in the two preceding units, and only eleven in the following one(s). What is more, an exclusive relationship in vocabulary between 7,1-6 and 7,7-25 does not exist: all common words of both units are present in chap. 6 as well, whereas 7,1-6 and 6,1-23 contain twelve words as exclusive property, the majority of which are of fundamental importance for the argumentation (ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, κυριεύω, καταργέω, καρποφορέω, ἐλεύθερος, νεκρός, ἐγείρω, τῷ θεῷ, ὅτε-νυνὶ δέ, καινότης, παλαιότης). Of these twelve words, a fact not to be underestimated, two never appear again in the entire *corpus paulinum* (καινότης, παλαιότης). In short, all these observations mean that we have a solid relationship between the first three units, and this obviously supports very strongly some recent proposals to consider 6,1-7,6 as a literary macro-unit<sup>(7)</sup>. Such an impression cannot but increase when we pay attention to the “actantial” and temporal criteria. In fact, in comparison with an on-going interchange of “we” and “you” in 6,1-7,6, the singular protagonist of the second part of chap. 7 — ἐγώ — points clearly to a separation between both macro-units. Similarly, the past tense which predominates in 7,7-23 shows a striking difference when compared to the variety of the preceding units with their continuous exchange of past, present and future tenses. Finally a touch of literary elegance is given to this proposal by means of the *inclusio* which is made of the exclusive property of the first three literary units (cf. Χριστός, ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καταργηθῇ, ἐν καινότητι, παλαιός in 6,4.6 with vv. 4 and 6 of chap. 7).

Yet, we have to admit that such a grouping is a matter of dispute. Many commentators prefer to see our passage as the introduction to the remainder of chap. 7, and this on the basis of two difficulties: (1) if ἀμαρτία occurs so frequently in chap. 6 (15 times), why does it not reappear in 7,1-6 as one would expect if the passage is to form a single macro-unit with the preceding chapter; and (2) how could the recurrent presence of νόμος in 7,1-6 (8 times) be explained, seeing that in chap. 6 it appears only twice, whereas in the rest of chap. 7 the term plays a key role? Is it not, they ask, that the lack of the term ἀμαρτία is an indication

<sup>(7)</sup> Ph. ROLLAND, *Épître aux Romains. Texte grec structuré* (Rome 1980) 24-25 and P. LAMARCHE-C. LE DÜ, *Épître aux Romains V-VIII. Structure littéraire et sens* (Paris 1980) 32-48.

of a separation of the passage from chap. 6, while the presence of νόμος points to its belonging to chap. 7<sup>(8)</sup>?

At this point we can say that it is not the number of repetitions of a single term which counts, but the importance of the term in the argumentation of a given unit. In order to have a clearer idea, an analysis of the internal logic of the passage is needed.

#### 7,1-6: The Focal Point of the Passage

The logic of the unit, delimited by the compactness of the sections which embrace it, seems to be obvious, judging from the number of commentaries. Surprisingly this is quite independent from the difference of opinions with regard to its belonging to the macro-units mentioned above (6,1-7,6 or 7,1-25)<sup>(9)</sup>. For most commentators the text begins with a legal principle indicating the condition of freedom from the law ("the law has power over a man only so long as he lives", v. 1). To it another basic axiom corresponds which states that this condition has come true for the Christian who, consequently, is freed from the law (v. 4; the same apostrophe, ἀδελφοί). These two principles are followed by their elaborations (vv. 2.3 and 5.6 begin with γάρ)<sup>(10)</sup>. In this way we have a linear progression of thought, the point of which would be the affirmation and demonstration of Christian freedom from the law.

In such a reconstruction of the logic of the passage, v. 4 simply recaptures the axiom of v. 1 and applies it to the Christian life, whereas verses 2-3 seemingly have no other function than to illustrate this accepted general truth, but in such an obscure and incoherent way that one sometimes wishes the verses had simply been omitted<sup>(11)</sup>. In fact, it is hard

<sup>(8)</sup> The difficulties have been pointed out by ZELLER, *Römer*, 131. He prefers to talk about the double function of the passage, which repeats some concepts of chap. 6 and at the same time introduces the themes of the second part of chap. 7. Other scholars are even more radical and refuse to see any significant link between 7,1-6 and chap. 6, considering the repetition of lexical material from the preceding units irrelevant. Cf. e.g. WILCKENS, *Römer* and CRANFIELD, *Romans*, ad loc.

<sup>(9)</sup> Even for P. LAMARCHE and C. LE DÜ, *Romains V-VIII*, 48, the focal point of the passage is the Christian freedom from the law: "Selon la section C (6,1-14) il [le chrétien] doit se conformer à la nouvelle vie qu'il a reçue. Mais cette nouvelle vie, selon la section C' (6,15 à 7,6) est non seulement libérée du péché, mais encore libérée de la Loi. Sans minimiser le premier aspect, c'est sans doute le second qui constitue la pointe logique de cette double section".

<sup>(10)</sup> The division which follows, proposed by WILCKENS, *Römer*, 63, is in fact a presupposition of interpretation for all the other commentators, even when it is not credited as such:

Grundsatz des Gesetzes (ἀδελφοί – v. 1)

Explication (γάρ – vv. 2-3)

Grundsatz der Befreiung vom Gesetz (ἀδελφοί – v. 4)

Ausführung (γάρ – vv. 4-5).

<sup>(11)</sup> E.g. DODD, *Romans*, 101: "The illustration... has gone hopelessly astray. The only *tertium comparationis* that remains is the bare fact that, in one way or another, death puts an end to obligations. We shall do best to ignore the illustration as far as may be, and ask what it is that Paul is really talking about in the realm of fact and experience".

to understand why Paul speaks of husband and wife in his image instead of a husband alone and, moreover, why he has the husband die instead of the wife, undermining the axiom of v. 1 with this inconsistency.

Without denying the possibility of the author's failure to sustain his thought, one can surely doubt an interpretative proposal which, to defend itself, has to get rid of the very part of the text which it wants to explain. The doubt only increases when one realizes that this same fate would touch not only the image Paul adduces, but also vv. 4-5. In fact, if Paul had wanted to prove Christian freedom from the law, vv. 1 and 6 would have been enough to make his point. In v. 1 the Apostle recalled the generally accepted principle that death ends submission to the law<sup>(12)</sup>. He would prove everything by mentioning in v. 6 the fact of death through baptism, worked out in detail in the first part of chap. 6. If the content of v. 2 could still be of use as an illustration of the axiom, even though this is hardly probable because the matter is too obvious to require further explanation and also because the presumed illustration has been badly chosen and produces the opposite effect, vv. 3-5 would be totally superfluous. Or better yet, they would only confuse the reader who desperately looks for justification of their presence.

So the effort to limit the passage to the problem of Christian freedom from the law ends by acknowledging that more than 70 per cent of the text has no meaning for the argument and one must accept Paul's failure to illustrate his affirmations adequately. Therefore, another interpretation, in which the seemingly pointless additions receive the attention they merit, is more promising. It is the possibility, and even the necessity, to respond to moral demands in two mutually exclusive situations — being under the law and being independent of it. Two formal observations concerning the image itself lead us in this direction, both highlighting v. 3, where the problem of being or not being an adulteress is a moral consideration par excellence.

The first one is a grammatical detail. Verse 3 begins with an illative particle (ἄρα), its inferential meaning even more strengthened by οὖν which follows it immediately (English "wherefore, therefore" is a good equivalent). Such a beginning gives a strong deductive characteristic to the phrase, whereas the preceding v. 2 presents itself as a premise from which the inferences are drawn. The premise, even though very important, is not the point of arrival, but of departure. But if the focal point of the passage were freedom from the law, the stress would be on v. 2, and v. 3 would remain "no more than flesh on the bones of the illustration" as J. Ziesler affirms with many others<sup>(13)</sup>.

The second observation comes from the analysis of the semantic field of ἡ ὑπανδρος γυνή. This appellation in v. 2, a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, occurs frequently in LXX and intertestamental literature (Num 5,20.29;

<sup>(12)</sup> The formula occurs in rabbinic literature (cf. m. Qid 1,1 in Str-B III,233 and m. Shab 30a; m. Nid 61b; PesR 51b; y. Kil IX,3 — the last four quoted in H.-J. SCHOEPS, *Paul. The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (London 1961) 171.

<sup>(13)</sup> *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 174.

Prov 6,24.29; Sir 9,9; 41,23; *Test Levi* 14,6). Significantly, each time we find it we meet with a well-specified moral context, namely the suspected or actual matrimonial infidelity of a woman. The use of this term, with its strong connotation, at the very beginning of the image serves as a clear indication that v.3, where μοιχαλῖς (adulteress) is mentioned twice, does not consist of empty words which the Apostle, following Jewish casuistry, uses to gratuitously amplify the description of the case, but is the precise goal aimed at from the very beginning. For the presumed demonstration of freedom from the law, let us repeat it again, this verse has no importance. Only if the consequences of submission to the law and of freedom from it for Christian moral acting are the intent of the passage, does this verse receive the attention it merits.

This same insistence is found in the second part of the passage (vv. 4-6), which also begins with the announcement of Christian freedom from the law. Again, this is only a premise, whereas the very point of the train of thought is moral acting. It is seen clearly in the progressive structure of v.4: a) ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ; b) εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρω; c) ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ, where phrase c), the last of the sequence, is the aim of the demonstration. That this observation holds not only for v.4 is shown by the correspondence between vv.4 and 6, the being an application of the former<sup>(14)</sup>. In fact, the three movements of the argumentative progression in v.4 find their equivalent in the two movements of v.6, the last insisting precisely on the necessity of the new service as a result of being released from the law: a) κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα; b) ὥστε δουλεῦειν ἡμᾶς. Both verses (4 and 6), as embracing the section dedicated to the past and the present of Christians, indicate that the total content refers to the problem of moral acting. And the collocation and solemn form of v.6<sup>(15)</sup>, which give the assertions of the Apostle the character of a last and conclusive word with regard to the question, only reinforce such an impression.

Finally, this same movement of thought from announcement of the *status* of the protagonists (wife and Christian) with regard to the law to the moral implications in their *modus vivendi* is met in those phrases of the passage which describe their past under the law (vv. 3a.5). The implications are totally opposite to those taken from the context of freedom from the law. If this freedom for the woman results in τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα, from submission to the law follows the declaration of being adulteress (μοιχαλῖς χρηματίζει). Similarly for the Christian, the life that is fruitful for God in the present not under the law is opposed to the life fruitful for death of the past under the law (v.5). Thus, subjection to the law is also contemplated from the point of view of the possibility (or impossibility) of the moral life which it offers, and significantly the Pauline

<sup>(14)</sup> Concerning the link between vv.4 and 6 cf. Z.I. HERMANN, "La novità cristiana secondo Romani 5,20-7,6; alcune osservazioni esegetiche", *Anton* 62 (1986) 269-270.

<sup>(15)</sup> About the solemn form of the phrase resulting from the antithetical connection of four substantives: novelty – old age – spirit – letter cf. L. MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, Michigan 1988) 271.

assertions in this regard are diametrically opposed to what contemporary Jewish writers thought<sup>(16)</sup>.

With these observations, we are now in a position to present some conclusions regarding the salient point of our passage. First of all, it does not seem that the intent could be freedom from the law as such. Indeed, that happens to be mentioned even more than once (cf. vv. 1.2.3.4.6), but not in order to prove it. The emphasis is placed rather on the practical implications of both submission to the law and freedom from it. In the last case what Paul wants is to refute eventual hasty conclusions, which could be provoked by the announcement of this liberty: in short, the refusal of an irresponsible and immoral life. In other words, the effort of the Apostle is to show that *freedom from* (the law) cannot be seen except as *freedom for*, i.e. for a new obedience. In such a view Paul's insistence on the negative consequences of the submission of the past appears as a strong refusal of its necessity for the right conduct of Christians, and in this way adds one more characteristic to the *freedom for* — it is the only freedom to offer a possibility of such acting which leads to life (cf. the strong contrast between ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ of v. 4 and εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ of v. 5).

#### 7,1-6: An Open Conclusion

We finished the first sounding of the lexical tissue of Rom 6–7 ascertaining that, in spite of numerous indications which invite one to consider 7,1-6 as a final part of the literary whole (6,1–7,6), the evident difference in the usage of both ἁμαρτία and νόμος opposes such a conclusion. The investigation of the internal logic of the passage just concluded permits an answer to the question.

The meager presence of terminology denoting sin in 7,1-6 does not mean that the issue of chap. 6 is absent, which was to prove that to turn back to sin meant to regress from life (communicated by the One Risen from the dead). Within our passage the same message is repeated, namely through the strong contrast between the Christian's "life fruitful for God" and "life fruitful for death" which corresponds to being or not being an adulteress in the case of the wife. Although the presumed difference is reduced to another terminology, the point remains unchanged.

Similarly, because the term νόμος abounds in the passage and in Rom 6 occurs only twice, this does not mean a radical change of perspective. We have seen that it is not the law as such nor the freedom from it that is the real point of the unity, but the revindication of an ethic for that time when the law no longer governs (κυριεύει). The Apostle put this same problem to his audience in 6,15 and tries to provide an adequate answer in the argumentation from 6,16 to 6,23.

<sup>(16)</sup> In contemporary Judaism the law should protect the moral behavior of its subjects and in such a way insure their life (cf. e.g. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 4,210-211; 16,43). In our passage, for both (wife and believer) the law shows itself totally incapable to prevent the sin or to remedy it. Even more, it dramatizes their situation, exposing the sin and declaring guilt, and arouses sinful passions, becoming in such a way the secondary cause of their "bearing fruit for death".

Thus, not only the formal evidence but also the internal logic of the passage seem to confirm its belonging to the literary and argumentative whole of 6,1–7,6. But what is the precise argumentative function of these repetitions and, consequently, of the entire passage?

All we have said above already contains elements of the answer. The content of chap. 6 is structured around two *subpropositiones*, 6,1 and 6,15<sup>(17)</sup>, which in typical diatribal form of false conclusions<sup>(18)</sup> drawn out of a *propositio principalis* (5,20–21) pose the question of the moral life in an age of the superabundance of grace (6,1) and without submission to the law (6,15). We have seen that our passage resumes the Pauline answers to both false conclusions, but in a way to touch particularly the imagination of his audience (illustration) with a strong emotional impact (cf. the two appellations ἀδελφοί μου in vv. 1 and 4) and in a very concise form. In this way the passage shows all the characteristics of the part of the *dispositio rhetorica*, namely the *peroratio* (epilogue) which should schematically recapitulate the themes dealt with in the preceding argumentation (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις)<sup>(19)</sup> in order to attract both the consent and emotional involvement of the listeners<sup>(20)</sup>.

Naturally, this summary can take place in any part of the discourse and does not presuppose that the subject has been dealt with exhaustively in all its aspects<sup>(21)</sup>. Indeed in the middle of a dense argument it has to remain open and refer to other units for the logical supplements of the discourse. Thus, if we meet some concepts and affirmations in 7,1–6 which are absent in the preceding train of thought (πνεῦμα in the final phrase and the radicalization of Paul's vision of the law), nothing is more natural from a rhetorical point of view. Instead of being a sign of a new argumentative unit, it is simply evidence of Paul's rhetorical capacities. In a temporary conclusion he succeeds in announcing the themes which he will deal with later on, namely the function of the law in 7,7–25 and the pneumatological dimension of Christian being and acting in chap. 8. We have then to deal with an open peroration which surely makes an easier transition from the argument of chap. 6 to those of chapters 7 and 8, but above all offers an impressive summary of the argumentation up to this point.

<sup>(17)</sup> For the characteristics and importance of the *propositiones* in Pauline argumentation see ALETTI, *Comment Dieu est-il juste?*, 36–38. The articulations of Rom 5–8 and the functions of some argumentative units are presented on p. 48.

<sup>(18)</sup> One can find more about the false conclusions in the diatribe and in Rom and about their structuring function in the Pauline argumentation in S. K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico, CA 1981) 119–154, especially 148–152.

<sup>(19)</sup> As Quintilian states in *Institutio oratoria* III.IX.7 (LCL; Cambridge, MA–London 1979–1986): “In hac, quae repetemus, quam brevissime dicenda sunt et, quod Graeco verbo patet (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις), decurrendum per capita”.

<sup>(20)</sup> For more information about the two aims of peroration cf. W. J. BRANDT, *The Rhetoric of Argumentation* (New York 1970) 68–69.

<sup>(21)</sup> As B. M. GARAVELLI states in her *Manuale di retorica* (Studi Bompiani; Milano 1988) 105.



*Function of the Image and Its Compatibility*

Two approaches, allegorical and analogical, explain the image of marriage in 7,2-3 in reference to vv. 4-6; excluded are those which limit it to a mere illustration of the principle that death puts an end to any obligation. The former one, very popular with the Fathers of the Church<sup>(22)</sup> and retained up to our own day<sup>(23)</sup>, insists on the identity of the protagonists of the image trying to find their equivalents in the application (vv. 4-6). The weak point of this approach, apart from the lack of signs in the text itself of such an intention of the author, is the fact that the salient point of the passage is not the identity of the characters, but rather reciprocal relationships, or more precisely the consequences and obligations born out of these relationships in the past and present.

From this point of view the analogy with its proportional structure "as A is to B, so C is to D" fits our text much better, where what is at stake is not so much similarity but *similarity of rapport*. Even this proposal, however, is not without shortcomings, not only because the transition between the image and the application is not the typical one for an analogy (instead of οὕτως or another comparative particle we have the illative ὥστε). Perhaps even more important is the fact that the content of the application surpasses the data of the image, describing the situations of the Christian (past and present) in a more radical way than those of the wife<sup>(24)</sup>.

The last observation suggests another approach, where the point of departure would be not so much the image but what we have up to now treated as its application. This approach seems to respect Paul's way of thinking. It was not that he deduced his announcements concerning pre-Christian and Christian life from the content of the image, but rather with its help he tried to present them in more familiar way. The primary data were his convictions about the past ἐν τῇ σαρκί and under the law on the one hand, and about the present identity, determined by the Christ-event, of the Christian on the other, wherein the image serves to illustrate both. What we are dealing with is a rhetorical figure, indicated in ancient manuals as the second usage of *exemplum* (παράδειγμα): "If we have no enthymemes, we must employ examples as demonstrative proofs,

<sup>(22)</sup> An overview of patristic interpretations of the passage is found in K.H. SCHEKLE, *Paulus Lehrer der Väter. Die altkirchliche Auslegung von Römer 1-11* (Düsseldorf 1959) ad loc.

<sup>(23)</sup> E.g. W. SANDAY-A. HEADLAM, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1980) and BARRETT, *Romans*, ad loc. J.A. LITTLE offers pertinent criticism of the allegorical approach in "Paul's Use of Analogy", 86-87.

<sup>(24)</sup> For the Christian the alternative does not exist either in the past or in the present; his new ethical horizon is wider than that of the wife, "not to be an adulteress". The consequences of the respective submissions in his case are expressed in terms of life – death; the vision of the law itself is more radical. LITTLE, "Paul's Use of Analogy", 84, makes a similar observation from the structural point of view: "The first and most obvious problem is structural. The analogy contains more elements than v. 1 but fewer than v. 4".

for conviction is produced by these; but if we have them, examples must be used as evidence and as a kind of epilogue to the enthymemes”<sup>(25)</sup>. Aristotle’s description corresponds perfectly to the situation we have in our passage: all the enthymemes actually have been given in the argumentation of chap. 6, and the image itself is a part of the peroration (Aristotle’s “*epilogue to the enthymemes*”). As *exemplum* it serves to recapitulate the preceding discussion and above all to give an impressive view of it. We will see how it attains the goal.

First of all we must realize that Paul has no easy task to accomplish. The Christian experience he wants to render more accessible by means of an illustration is in itself a unique and incomparable one. “Bearing fruit for God”, an expression which presents the nature of the Christian style of life (new possibilities in terms of morality), is in fact the result of baptismal participation in the death and resurrection of the Lord. It is such a profound participation that Paul can say that Christians have been dead and live now from among the dead (cf. 6,11-13, alluded to in our passage in v. 4). This experience has provoked a total break with the submission of the past (sin, law) and has established a new way of being (one’s new identity), from which springs the new way of acting. Therefore, we have here to reflect upon an event in which the same person dies and rises again, and for such an experience there are no examples<sup>(26)</sup>. If Paul now wants to make this experience more concrete through an illustration, he is forced by the nature of the situation to accept a partially inadequate example, in which it will be not the person who acquires the freedom for the new relationship, the one who dies, but somebody else. The image of marriage, in which the death of the husband releases the wife from a part of the law and makes her free for a new marriage, is perhaps the only available example in all the law<sup>(27)</sup> and it renders the idea in a very expressive manner given the fact that it is the law itself that provides it. Marriage, a reality dealt with by one of the ten commandments, is in fact an ideal example; it permits Paul to give the *coup de grâce* to his imaginary interlocutor on his own battleground and the employment of it proves his admirable rhetorical skillfulness.

The illustration of the transition from one bond to another which a Christian experiences through baptismal dying is not the only advantage of the example of marriage. Paul seems to exploit it in other ways too, and this justifies all the more his decision to use the image, even though it is imperfect.

<sup>(25)</sup> Aristotle, *The “Art” of Rhetoric* (LCL; Cambridge, MA–London 1975) II.XXV.8.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. the similar observations of P. ALTHAUS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen 1949) ad loc.: “Denn die Christen sind — mit Christus — gestorben und eben darum durch Gottes Wunder lebendig geworden, sie sind also, in ihrer «Ehe» mit dem Gesetze, der sterbende, aber zugleich der überlebende Teil und als solcher frei. Sie überleben das Gesetz, aber nun indem sie gleichsam auch sich selbst überleben. Diese paradoxe Wirklichkeit des Christenlebens sprengt jedes Gleichnis, spottet jeder Entsprechung”.

<sup>(27)</sup> However, this uniqueness works out only if one puts the accent on life after liberation. If Paul wanted to illustrate the fact of liberation from the law alone, his choice of the limping example would be poor since he had many better ones (e.g. death pays all debts). Therefore, partial inadequacy of the illustration does not weaken our proposal concerning the focal point of the passage.

We have already referred to the first one on the pages dedicated to the focal point of the passage. The rigidity of the norm, which contrary to other extrabiblical legal systems does not foresee discretion on the part of the husband to require application of the sanctions to the adulteress-wife<sup>(28)</sup>, is the point which Paul uses to reject any eventual claim that the law could be helpful for a moral life and consequently could serve life. In fact it not only does not protect the moral acting (actually the wife has relations with another man), but does not even permit the situation to be repaired. What the law brings is only death and nothing else. In such a way the example well illustrates the announcement of v. 5 where the law appears as a cause of "bearing fruit for death" and above all serves as an adequate answer to the false conclusion of 6,15, according to which not being under the law should lead to sin and to its result, death. The Pauline example intends the contrary: the risk of the death one runs under the law.

Another point which the example makes is the irreversibility of the Christian situation. A woman may have relations with another man only when her present husband has died. Christ, to whom Christians belong, is ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθεὶς, specified in 6,9 by οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει. The example shows in this way that there is no possibility of breaking the marriage bond with Him. The Apostle renders in legal terms what in vv. 4-6 of the passage and in first verses of the chap. 6 he affirmed: because of the irreversibility of time there is no way to return to the past. The result is the total incompatibility of belonging to Christ and submitting to the law. The *aut-aut* of the exclusive belonging to the husband qualifies any attempt to belong to another as adultery. Being of Christ and still trying to subjugate oneself to the law means sin, a conclusion which is the reverse of the false one in 6,15, from which springs the argumentation of the second part of the chapter.

The image of spousal relationship is important for Paul's argumentation from another point of view, perhaps the most important as far as rhetoric is concerned. As Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca observe in their treatise on argumentation, the argumentative function of the example is to be a technical proof, whereas the role of the illustration "is to strengthen adherence to a known and accepted rule... While an example must be beyond question, an illustration need not be, as adherence to the rule does not depend on it. On the other hand it should strike the imagination forcibly so as to win attention"<sup>(29)</sup>. The illustration taken from matrimonial life surely has such an imaginative force. It recalls the basic archetypes, embracing the whole of mankind bound with this fundamental human reality, and perhaps is the most important and certainly the most touching category used in the Bible to describe the essence of the covenant between God and his people, which is love. But the full meaning of this we can grasp only when we compare the image with the immediately preceding unit where Paul used the language of slavery to defend the moral acting of a Christian outside the jurisdiction of the law

<sup>(28)</sup> For a more detailed treatment of the subject cf. A. TOSATO, *Il matrimonio israelitico* (AnBib 100; Roma 1982) 122-125.

<sup>(29)</sup> Ch. PERELMAN-L. OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame, IN-London 1971) 357.

and for which inadequacy he himself apologizes to his readers (6,19). The marriage union surely better respects the nature of the relation between Christ and his own, the relation of which love shown on the cross is the distinct sign (cf. 7,6 which repeats 6,4), and service is only the return of a received gift and is carried out ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος.

### Conclusions

Our point of departure was the openly-confessed embarrassment over the exegesis of a text whose basic meaning seems clear, namely to affirm and prove Christian freedom from the law. The causes of such embarrassment were two: (1) inconsistency between the literary tissue of the passage which almost repeats chap. 6 and its presumed point which would go better with the rest of chap. 7; (2) apparent incongruity of the image of marriage with the above-mentioned basic meaning (occupying almost half the text, the image not only was of no use for the train of thought, adding only banalities, but even produced the opposite effect).

Attention to the surface of the text has permitted us to discover another perspective in which the entire image is well adapted to the point of the passage. Such a perspective is the strong refusal of libertinism and licentious conduct in the new situation of being a Christian, deriving from communication with the Risen Christ. Freedom from the law is but one of its characteristics.

The content of the passage seen from this point of view appears as a well-organized resumption of the preceding argument, originated by the two *subpropositiones* of chap. 6 (vv. 1 and 15) and it has the clear rhetorical function of the *peroratio* (epilogue). This resumption, apart from a synthesis of the subjects previously dealt with, refers the reader to the logical supplements of the discourse in the rest of chap. 7 and in chap. 8.

The marriage image which embarrasses so many commentators because of its inadequacy to the problem of liberation from the law, from the rhetorical point of view is an *exemplum* (παράδειγμα). It illustrates well both the past and the present of the Christian with their consequences (transgression and death) and obligations (bearing fruit for God). For this reason it refers above all to vv. 4-6 and together with them offers a summary of previous argumentation. The incompatibility of the example with the announcement of v. 1 is to be understood as follows: the Apostle can permit this incongruity because freedom from the law is not the point of his demonstration and he cannot avoid it because of the absolute and paradoxical novelty of the Christian experience which contradicts any comparison and escapes any illustration. In this sense the partial bankruptcy of the *exemplum* could be an invitation addressed to the reader to become also a sharer in the fascination of the καινότης which enchants Paul himself from very beginning of the macro-unity (6,4) up to its very end (7,6)<sup>(30)</sup>.

Via di San Sebastianello 11  
00187 Roma

Andrzej GIENIUSZ, CR

<sup>(30)</sup> I thank S. Mary Isaac Jogues Rousseau, SSND who kindly read my paper.

## Su di una norma matrimoniale 4QD

Con la particolare competenza che le viene da studi accurati in tema di *zēnūt* negli scritti giudaici intertestamentari<sup>(1)</sup>, Liliana Rosso Ubigli si è recentemente occupata<sup>(2)</sup> di un breve passo dei frammenti del *Codice di Damasco*, trovati a suo tempo nella IV Grotta di Qumran (= 4QD). Lo aveva da poco reso noto, nell'ambito di una sommaria anticipazione della *editio princeps* di tali frammenti, J. Baumgarten<sup>(3)</sup>. Egli decifrava e traduceva il testo nel modo seguente:

[ואשר יקרן] לונת לאשתו אשר לא כמשפט רצא ולא שוב עוד

He who fornicates with his wife contrary to the law shall depart and return no more.

Alla traduzione—forse di proposito un po' approssimativa e ambigua—non faceva seguito delucidazione di sorta<sup>(4)</sup>.

L'interessante, nuovo passo non ha mancato di attirare l'attenzione di Rosso Ubigli, che lodevolmente ha cercato di vederci più chiaro. Ella traduce:

Chi si accosta a sua moglie a scopo di fornicazione, trasgredendo la Legge, uscirà (dalla comunità) per non esservi più riammesso;

<sup>(1)</sup> «Il Documento di Damasco e la Halakah settaria (Rassegna di studi)», *RevQ* 9 (1978) 357-399; «Alcuni aspetti della concezione della *porneia* nel tardo-Giudaismo», *Henoch* 1 (1979) 201-242.

<sup>(2)</sup> «Il Documento di Damasco e l'etica coniugale: a proposito di un nuovo passo qumranico», *Henoch* 14 (1992) 3-10.

<sup>(3)</sup> J. M. BAUMGARTEN, «The Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research», *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. BROSHI) (Jerusalem 1992), 51-62 (in specie p. 54). Stando alla ricostruzione (avventurosa e precaria) di B. Z. WACHOLDER e M. G. ABEGG, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four, Fascicule One* (Washington, DC 1991) 35 e 46, di questo passo 4QD esisterebbero due frammenti: il D (d) 12, linee 4-5 (mutilo: restano soltanto le prime tre parole e parte delle ultime tre) e il D (e) 11, col. I, linee 12-13 (pressoché integro).

<sup>(4)</sup> Baumgarten si limitava a commentare, quasi rassegnato e in modo poco incoraggiante: «We can only speculate as to the nature of the marital transgression...» («The Laws of the *Damascus Document*», 54). Circa la decifrazione, non ancora verificabile, si può felicemente costatare che il testo sembra pressoché integro. Circa la traduzione inglese, confrontabile con il testo ebraico addotto, si è già in grado di esprimere un parere. Essa appare «approssimativa» in quel «fornicates», che risolve *yiqrab lizēnūt* (o *lizēnôt*) in *yizneh*; «ambigua» in quel «contrary»: lo si può intendere, infatti, sia come avverbio (= «fornica... contrariamente alla Legge»), sia come aggettivo (= «con sua moglie contraria alla Legge»).

e propone di individuare questa trasgressione della Legge (ovviamente, della Legge secondo l'interpretazione data o condivisa dall'autore) nei rapporti coniugali tenuti «con intenti illeciti»<sup>(5)</sup>, finalizzati cioè al piacere e non alla procreazione (per esempio, quelli intercorsi con moglie gravida). Tali rapporti, per quanto compiuti all'interno del matrimonio, verrebbero qui riconosciuti contrari all'«etica coniugale»<sup>(6)</sup> e severamente puniti.

La proposta può apparire fondata e di per sé plausibile<sup>(7)</sup>. Ritengo tuttavia possibili e più sicure, forse anche più pertinenti, una traduzione e una interpretazione in parte diverse da quelle avanzate da Rosso Ubigli. Prendendo per buone la decifrazione e la ricostruzione del testo offerte da Baumgarten<sup>(8)</sup>, e attenendomi alla lettera, traduco:

E colui che si avvicina per «prostituzione» a sua moglie, la quale non è secondo la normativa giuridica, dovrà uscire (dalla comunità) e non far(vi) più ritorno<sup>(9)</sup>.

<sup>(5)</sup> Questo è il senso in cui ROSSO UBIGLI, «Il Documento di Damasco», 8, intende il *lznwt* del nostro passo.

<sup>(6)</sup> Cf. il titolo stesso dell'art. di Rosso Ubigli, cit. sopra, in n. 2.

<sup>(7)</sup> A sostegno della sua interpretazione, Rosso Ubigli si appella a due fenomeni, che effettivamente risultano attestati negli scritti giudaici dell'epoca intertestamentaria, e cioè: da un lato quello dell'allargamento del valore semantico di *zēnūt* («prostituzione») e del suo corrispettivo greco *porneia*, dall'altro quello della diffusione di un giudizio etico negativo nei confronti dei rapporti coniugali che non siano finalizzati alla procreazione. I passi, puntualmente richiamati, sono tratti dal libro di Tobia (Tb 8,7), dai Testamenti dei Patriarchi (T. Aser 5,1; T. Issacher 2,3; 3,5), da Filone (*Spec. L.* III 9.34-36.113; *Q. Gen.* IV 86; *Cher.* 43; *Deter.* 102; *Ios.* 43; *Mos.* I 28) e da Giuseppe Flavio (*Bellum Iudaicum* II 160-161, circa gli Esseni). L'autrice si richiama anche a un altro frammento 4QD, cui fa cenno BAUMGARTEN, «The Laws of the Damascus Document», 53: vi si leggerebbe un divieto di congiungersi alla moglie incinta. E tuttavia, resta un doppio motivo di incertezza circa questa proposta interpretativa. Primo: di fatto (se ben vedo) in nessuno dei testi addotti (neppure in Tb 8,7, cf. sotto), né in altri (tra quanti io conosca), i rapporti coniugali (tra coniugi legittimi), qualora tenuti per fini edonistici e non riproduttivi, vengono designati con il termine *zēnūt/porneia*. Secondo: pure a voler supporre che *zēnūt/porneia* fosse giunto nell'uso a coprire anche questo settore semantico, sembra comunque difficile che ciò sia avvenuto nel passo qui in esame. È infatti incongruo che una trasgressione peculiarmente etica (tale al più è qualificabile una congiunzione tra legittimi coniugi ordinata al piacere) venga fatta oggetto di una norma di diritto penale e per di più punita con tanta severità (su ciò si veda più avanti, nel testo). Per non parlare poi dell'esigenza di accertare l'avvenuta trasgressione, onde poter passare all'applicazione della sanzione, il che sembra postulare una trasgressione di carattere palese o facilmente palesabile, e quindi contestabile ai trasgressori.

<sup>(8)</sup> In attesa di vedere le foto dei frammenti, non resta che prendere il testo così come ci viene fornito.

<sup>(9)</sup> *Ad singula verba* (a) [wa]ʾāšer: corrisponde all'espressione biblica *wē'is'āšer*, tipico esordio di una norma penale inserita in una lista (cf. Lv 20,11.12.13.14.15.17.18.20.21; della norma che apre la lista, in Lv 20,10, l'esordio è: *kī-š' is'*); di qui la traduzione: «e colui che»; (b) *yiqrab*: il verbo biblico *qrb*, «avvicinarsi», assume il senso più specifico di «avere rapporti carnali» in caso di «avvicinamento» a donna (cf. Gn 20,4; Lv 18,14; Is 8,3; anche CD V 9); e così è anche nel nostro passo. Nel tradurre, tuttavia, non sempre è necessario esplicitare, perché a volte la connotazione 'sessuale' viene sufficientemente indicata da altre espressioni che accompagnano il verbo *qrb* (cf. p. es. Lv 18,6: *lō' tiqrēbū lēgallōt 'erwāh*); e così è nel nostro passo (*yiqrab lizēnūt*); di qui: «si avvicina»; (c) *lizēnūt*: preposizione

Non è difficile riconoscere che ci troviamo davanti a una norma penale, né è difficile identificare la sanzione (nell'apodosi); appare invece più problematico identificare il reato (nella protasi): perché mai vengono designati *zēnūt*, considerati reato, e puniti come reato grave, dei rapporti sessuali che un uomo intrattiene con la propria moglie? Propongo di individuare il reato in questione nei rapporti sessuali (illegittimi, *zēnūt*)<sup>(10)</sup> tenuti deliberata-

(*lē*) + sostantivo (*zēnūt*); quanto alla preposizione, *lē* serve ad indicare la finalità verso cui tende l'azione espressa dal verbo (qui *yiqrab*); quanto al sostantivo, opto per la forma nominale senza articolo (a preferenza della forma verbale *lizēnūt* o della forma nominale con articolo *lazzēnūt*, di per sé ugualmente possibili e omologhe quanto al significato), tenuto conto delle altre ricorrenze di *znwt* in CD e della corrispondenza con l'espressione *dia porneian* di Tb 8,7 (su tutto ciò si veda più avanti); nel linguaggio giuridico (com'è nel nostro caso), il termine *zēnūt* assume un significato tecnico, dice il reato «prostituzione»; di qui: «per 'prostituzione'»; (d) *lē'istō*: preposizione (*lē*) + sostantivo con suffisso pronominale (*'istō*); quanto alla preposizione, *lē* serve qui ad indicare la direzione verso cui è rivolto il movimento espresso dal verbo (*yiqrab*); nella consimile espressione biblica si trova la preposizione *'el* (*qarab 'el-'iššāh*, «avvicinarsi a una donna»; cf. Lv 18,19; Ez 18,6); *lē* rimpiazza *'el* senza alterarne funzione e senso; quanto al sostantivo con suffisso pronominale, *'istō* precisa che la donna in questione è la propria moglie (cf. Nm 30,17, citato in CD VII 8//XIX 5; lo stesso vale per Gn 2,24), non una donna qualsiasi (si tratta quindi, in senso stretto, di 'rapporti coniugali'); di qui: «a sua moglie»; (e) *'āšer*: vi riconosco un pronome relativo e lo ricollego, con la frase relativa che segue, al termine immediatamente precedente *'štw*: è la forma sintattica più comune nell'uso di *'šr*, cf. Gn 3,12; 20,3; Lv 15,18; 20,16; CD I 14.16; IV 1.9.19; VII 10.11 (Rosso Ubigli — forse anche Baumgarten — sembra riconoscerli invece una congiunzione e la ricollega, con la frase che segue, all'insieme della proposizione che precede, [*w*]/*'šr yqr[b]*...); di qui: «la quale»; (f) *lō' kammišpaṭ: hammišpāt*, al singolare, ha valore collettivo, indica l'insieme delle norme: non quelle di un codice etico, ma del sacro codice legislativo di Israele, dello *ius mosaicum* (cf. Lv 5,10; 1 Cron 15,13); più restrittivamente, si fa allusione qui all'insieme delle norme matrimoniali, di cui in Lv 18,4.5.26; 20,22 si parla in termini di *mišpāṭay*, in CD V 9 e VII 2 in termini di *mišpāt* (V 9: *mišpāt hā'ārāyōt*; VII 2: *kammišpāt*); di qui: «non (è) secondo la normativa giuridica»; (g) *wēyāšā'*...: la frase che ha qui inizio è inequivoca; costituisce l'apodosi, determina la pena da infliggere a chi commette il reato di cui nella protasi, cf. Dt 23,11.

<sup>(10)</sup> Vengono qui qualificati *zēnūt*, «prostituzione» (non «fornicazione»; *znh* significa «prostituirsi», *zōnāh* è la «prostituta»), dei rapporti sessuali avvenuti tra coniugi, in base al fatto e per il fatto che la Legge li giudica, date le circostanze (rese esplicite nel contesto della nostra norma, e di cui sotto, alla n. 13), illegittimi. Ciò viene detto *in obliquo*. Com'è buona regola, il legislatore non dà nella sua norma una definizione di *zēnūt*: richiama soltanto questa categoria criminosa, evidentemente ben nota, per sottolineare piuttosto, *in recto*, l'intenzionalità dell'atto criminoso (*lizēnūt*: cf. la nota seguente) e passare rapidamente al punto che è l'obiectum della sua statuizione, e cioè la determinazione della pena. — Si noterà come il termine *zēnūt* sia usato qui con un valore semantico tecnico-giuridico (come categoria criminosa), che tuttavia non stravolge il suo significato originario di «prostituzione»: il legislatore se ne serve per designare con termine squalificante dei rapporti sessuali che, di per sé, in quanto rapporti coniugali, non meriterebbero affatto una designazione così infamante, e che tuttavia, nella fattispecie, in quanto compiuti tra coniugi illegittimi, sono viziati in radice e vanno quindi assolutamente banditi. Non sorprenderà di trovare il corrispettivo termine *zōnāh*, «prostituta», predicato di una moglie illegittima.

mente (*lizēnūt*)<sup>(11)</sup> con la propria moglie (*'ištō*) *illegittima* (*'āšer lō' kammišpāt*)<sup>(12)</sup>, con colei cioè che (a questo o a quel titolo) gli è vietata come moglie dalla Legge matrimoniale<sup>(13)</sup>. Contro simile trasgressione, grave e deli-

(11) Giudico l'espressione *lizēnūt* tutt'altro che accessoria all'enunciazione di questa norma (si consideri il tenore della sanzione ivi stabilita; su ciò cf. n. 14). Una cosa è indicare la fattispecie del reato nei rapporti coniugali avuti con la moglie illegittima, qualificandola *zēnūt* (compimento materiale della *zēnūt*), altra cosa indicarla nei rapporti coniugali avuti con la moglie illegittima, precisando che si sono avuti *per* compiere *zēnūt* (compimento formale, deliberato della *zēnūt*). Non soltanto «approssimativa», dunque, ma anche inappropriata appare la traduzione proposta da Baumgarten, là dove risolve *yiqrab lizēnūt in yizneh* («fornicates»). Di regola le ridondanze verbali non fanno parte dei testi legislativi; rischioso quindi supporle presenti e comunque errato, nel nostro caso, procedere a riduzioni.

(12) La illegittimità della propria moglie — a qualsiasi titolo le provenga (per la casistica, cf. la nota seguente) — rende *zēnūt* i rapporti sessuali del marito con lei. Si ritrova qui, se ben vedo, una caratteristica della normativa matrimoniale biblica (non solo di natura penale, cf. Lv 20, ma a volte anche di natura civile, cf. Lv 18), quella cioè che i matrimoni illegittimi vengono colpiti dalla sanzione (e a volte anche semplicemente proibiti) all'atto della loro consumazione, e non all'atto della loro stipulazione. Per esempio, in Lv 20,19 si legge: *wē'erwat 'āhōt 'immēkā wa'āhōt 'ābikā lō' tēgallēh kī 'et-šē'ērō hē'ērāh 'āwōnām yiššā'ū*, «e la nudità della sorella di tua madre e della sorella di tuo padre non scoprirai, perché è denudare la sua carne: essi porteranno (la pena per) la loro colpa»; in Lv 18,13 si legge: *'erwat 'āhōt-'immēkā lō' tēgallēh kī-šē'ēr 'immēkā hiw'*, «la nudità della sorella di tua madre tu non scoprirai, perché è la carne di tua madre». — I contatti tra il nostro passo e la normativa matrimoniale biblica non si limitano a questo. Si possono anche notare alcune comuni caratteristiche linguistiche (sintattiche e terminologiche). Per esempio, in Lv 18,6 (il verso che introduce la lista dei matrimoni, o meglio dei congiungimenti coniugali, vietati) si legge: *'iš 'iš 'el-kol-šē'ēr bēšārō lō' tiqrēbū lēgallōt 'erwāh*, «nessuno si avvicinerà per scoprir(ne) (la) nudità ad alcuna carne del suo corpo». Ora, nel nostro passo a *'iš 'iš* corrisponde *wa'āšer*, a *'el-kol-šē'ēr bēšārō* corrisponde *lē'istō 'āšer lō' kammišpāt* a *lō' tiqrēbū* fa eco *yiqrab*, a *lēgallōt 'erwāh* corrisponde *lizēnūt*.

(13) Diversi sono gli elementi che la legge — già quella dei testi biblici (in specie, Lv 18 e 20), e poi più ancora quella dell'interpretazione rigorista dei settari giudei di epoca ellenistica — eleva a titoli di impedimento matrimoniale (o meglio, come s'è detto, a titoli di impedimento «coniugale»), rendendo illegittima la propria moglie e illegittimi i rapporti coniugali con lei. Donde diverse categorie di mogli «illegittime» (*'āšer lō' kammišpāt, zōnōt*) e diverse categorie di rapporti coniugali «illegittimi» (*zēnūt/porneia*). A puro titolo esemplificativo, è possibile stilare il seguente elenco:

(a) moglie straniera (*Giubilei* 20,4; 22,20; 25,1-10; 30,7-17 [con riferimento a Lv 18,21]; 4QMMT; cf. già Es 34,16; Dt 7,3; Mt 2,11; Esd 9,10) o semplicemente estranea al proprio casato (Lv 21,14; Tb 4,12; *Giubilei* 4,33 e *passim*; *T. Levi* 9,10; *T. Giobbe* 45,3; 11QT LVII 15-19; cf. già Gn 24 e 28,1-9);

(b) moglie «incestuosa» (*Giubilei* 33,9-20; 41,25-26; CD V 7-11; 11QT LXVI 11-17; cf. Lv 18,6-17; 20,11.12.14.17.19.20.21; Dt 23,1);

(c) seconda moglie finché la prima è in vita (CD IV 20-21; 11QT LVII 17-19; cf. Gn 2,24 e Lv 18,18, nell'interpretazione che di questi passi ho dato in «The Law of Leviticus 18:18: A Reexamination», *CBQ* 46 [1984] 199-214 e in «On Genesis 2:24», *CBQ* 52 [1990] 389-409);

(d) moglie adultera (*Giubilei* 33,7-9; 41,20; *T. Ruben* 3,15; 1QapGen 20,15; cf. Gn 20,4; Dt 24,1-4; Ger 3,1; al riguardo ho scritto in «Joseph, Being a Just Man (Matt 1:19)», *CBQ* 41 [1979] 547-551).

L'impedimento di legge, come si vede, può essere precedente alla stipulazione del matrimonio (per esempio, l'appartenenza a una nazione straniera, o il rientrare in alcuni stretti gradi di parentela o di affinità), oppure successivo alla stipulazione e anteriore alla consumazione del matrimonio (per esempio nel caso di «sposa» sedotta), oppure successivo alla stipulazione e successivo anche alla consumazione del



berata, viene adottata grave e definitiva sanzione (*wěyāšā' wēlō' šūb 'ôd*)<sup>(14)</sup>.

A conferma di una simile interpretazione mi pare si possa addurre l'insieme delle ricorrenze di *zēnūt* (*zônāh*) reperibili nel *Codice di Damasco*<sup>(15)</sup>, il medesimo scritto cui viene attribuito il frammento in esame: CD II 16; IV 17.20; VII 1 (?)<sup>(16)</sup> e VIII 5 (/XIX 17). Il termine sembra qui designare sempre il reato di rapporti coniugali viziati in radice, essendo basati su di un matrimonio *contra legem*.

(1) In II 16 si esorta a camminare in tutte le vie (= leggi) di Dio e a non procedere nei pensieri dell'inclinazione colpevole e degli «occhi di prostituzione» [*w'ny* (= *w'yny*) *znwt*]<sup>(17)</sup>. Ad ammonimento si rievoca la sorte dei «Vigilanti del Cielo», i «Figli di Dio» (= gli angeli) di cui in Gn 6,1-4 si legge che presero in mogli le «figlie degli uomini», dando origine ai «giganti». Costoro vengono indicati, a quest'epoca e in questo ambiente, come «figli di *zēnūt*»<sup>(18)</sup>.

(2 e 3) In IV 17 si contesta agli Israeliti di essere rimasti impigliati ne «le tre reti di Belial», scambiate per «tre specie di giustizia» (*myny hšdq*):

matrimonio (per esempio nel caso di «consorte» adultera). Quanto all'efficacia, è importante costatare che — per usare categorie canonistiche — in nessun caso questi impedimenti sono *dirimenti* (proibiscono e impediscono che il matrimonio sia validamente contratto); essi sono sempre e soltanto *impedienti* (proibiscono, ma non rendono irritato, privo di valore giuridico, il matrimonio). La soluzione legalmente obbligata, per coniugi che si trovino in stato di illegittimità matrimoniale, è il divorzio; l'alternativa è la *zēnūt*.

(14) L'espulsione definitiva dalla comunità. Si tratta di una sanzione particolarmente grave, come Rosso UBIGLI, «Il Documento di Damasco», 4, a ragione sottolinea, rimandando alla *Regola della Comunità* (IQS VIII 20 – IX 2: così vanno punite le trasgressioni deliberate della Legge di Mosè). Cf. IQS VII 1-2.16-17; e già, ciascun testo a suo modo, MI 2,11 e Esd 9-10 (in specie 10,8).

(15) Mi riferisco alle ricorrenze di *zēnūt* presenti nei fogli del CD già pubblicati da Schechter nel 1910, in base ai 2 MSS trovati nella *gueniza* di una sinagoga qaraita del Cairo. Seguo, per il testo, E. QIMRON, «The Text of CDC», *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 9-49.

(16) Il MS ha *zwnwt* (= *zônôt*), «prostitute»; ma sembra ragionevole correggere, come già faceva Schechter, in *znwt* (= *zēnūt*), «prostituzione». A meno che non sia da preferire, sulla base dei *zwnwt* e *znwt* di 4Q 394-399 (= 4QTTM) – cf. R. EISENMAN e M. WISE, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset 1992) doc. 35, p. 192; J.T. MILIK, DJD III, 223 e 225 –, di mantenere tal quale lo *zwnwt* del MS, leggendolo però non già *zônôt*, bensì *zônūt*, e ravvisandovi una *scriptio plena* di *znwt* (questa diversa ortografia potrebbe essere il riflesso della pronuncia di *znwt* nell'ebraico parlato dei giudei di Qumran).

(17) L'espressione *'ēnē zēnūt*, che si trova anche altrove (IQS I 6: *lb 'šmh w'yny znwt*; cf. IQpHab V 7: *lw' znw 'hr 'ynyhm*; 11QT LIX 14: *whmlk 'šr znh lbw w'ynyw mmšwwti*), sembra efficace: con gli occhi ci si invaghisce di una donna, e ne può seguire la *zēnūt*. Da intendersi: non una generica «lussuria», ma la ben più grave violazione della Legge matrimoniale, qualora la donna «adocchiata» non sia consentita come moglie (cf. *Giubilei* 20,4).

(18) Cf. *1Enoch* 8,2; 10,9; 4QEn Giants [a] 8,9 (J.T. MILIK, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4* [Oxford 1976] 314-315; K. BEYER, *Die aramäische Texte vom Toten Meer* [Göttingen 1984] 261); *Giubilei* 7,21; 20,4-5; cf. *T. Ruben* 5,5-7. Sembra che tali unioni vengano considerate come forma particolarmente aberrante e prototipo dei «matrimoni misti». Questa *zēnūt* va ascritta alla categoria (a) della lista data in n. 13.

la prima è «la prostituzione» (*hznwt*), la seconda è «la ricchezza» [*hhyn* (= *hhwn*)], la terza «la contaminazione del santuario» (*tm' hmqaš*). Viene di seguito chiarito (IV 20) che essi restano intrappolati «in due modi nella prostituzione» (*bšty m bznwt*): «nel prendere due mogli nella loro vita (*laqaḥat šētē našīm bēḥayyēhem*)» (IV 20-21)<sup>(19)</sup>; e forse anche<sup>(20)</sup> nel contrarre matrimoni tra zio e nipote (V 7-10)<sup>(21)</sup>.

(4) In VII 1-2 si elenca, tra gli obblighi che gravano sui membri del «Patto», «di non tradire ciascuno la carne della sua carne (*wēlō' yim'al 'iš bišē'er bēšārō*), tenendosi lontano dalle «prostitute» [o dalla «prostituzione»] secondo la normativa giuridica (*lēhazzār min hazzōnōt [min hazonūt/hazzēnūt] kammišpāt*)»<sup>(22)</sup>. L'iniziale, trasparente richiamo a Lev 18<sup>(23)</sup> permette di capire che quest'obbligo di rifuggire le *zōnōt* (o la *zonūt/zēnūt*) non è nient'altro che l'obbligo di non violare l'insieme degli impedimenti matrimoniali<sup>(24)</sup> che la comunità leggeva in quel testo biblico.

(5) In VIII 5 (/XIX 17) si parla dei membri infedeli della comunità, su cui incombe il castigo divino: essi «non si sono allontanati dalla via dei ri-

<sup>(19)</sup> Un'interpretazione forse corrispondente al senso originario di Lv 18,18; cf. A. TOSATO, «The Law of Leviticus 18:18: A Reexamination», *CBQ* 46 (1984) 199-214. Questa *zēnūt* va ascritta alla categoria (c) della lista data in n. 13.

<sup>(20)</sup> Individuandovi la seconda forma di *zēnūt* cui sembra alludere il *bištayim* di CD IV 20.

<sup>(21)</sup> «Ed essi prendono ciascuno la figlia del proprio fratello o la figlia della propria sorella. Ma Mosè ha detto: Alla sorella di tua madre non ti avvicinerai (*lō' tiqrab*), essa è carne di tua madre (*šē'er 'immēkā hī'*). La normativa circa le 'nudità' (*mišpāt hā'ārāyōt*), certo, è scritto per gli uomini, ma come (per) loro (vale per) le donne; e se la figlia del fratello scopre la nudità del fratello, anche essa è 'carne' (*šē'er*)». Si tratta dunque dell'interpretazione estensiva di uno degli impedimenti matrimoniali fissati da Lv 18 (quello del v. 13; cf. Lv 20,19) ed escludenti il *connubium* tra persone legate da uno stretto grado di parentela. Per la comprensione di forma e contenuto di questa importante pericope può tornare utile un raffronto con le pericope di Sir 23,16-27 e di *T. Levi* aram. b 14-18 (sulle quali si tornerà di sfuggita più sotto). Questa *zēnūt* va ascritta alla categoria (b) della lista data in n. 13.

<sup>(22)</sup> Non fa molta differenza, in ordine alla determinazione del senso di *zēnūt* — cosa della quale qui ci si occupa —, che si preferisca correggere lo *zwnwt* del MS in *znwt*, oppure mantenere il testo com'è, leggendo poi o *zōnūt* «prostituzione», o *zōnōt*, «prostitute» (cf. sopra, n. 16). Queste «prostitute» andrebbero comunque individuate come «mogli illegittime» in quanto proibite dalla Legge. Cf. sotto, la nota seguente a proposito del  *pornos* di Sir 23,17, e ancora n. 37 a proposito del *zny'n* di *T. Levi* aram., b 14-17). Si veda anche m. Yev 6,5.

<sup>(23)</sup> Lv 18,6: *'iš 'iš 'el-kol-šē'er bēšārō lō' tiqrēbū*; cf. 25,49: *miššē'er bēšārō mim-mišpaḥtō*. Va segnalato che anche Sir 23,17 (*anthrōpos pornos en sōmati sarkos autou*) con tutta verosimiglianza qualifica come «prostituto» il trasgressore degli impedimenti matrimoniali di cui in Lv 18. A sostenerlo era già O. A. FRITZSCHE, *Die Weisheit Jesus-Sirach's* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des AT; Leipzig 1859) 120-121, e sulla sua scia anche R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin 1906) 210, in base alla corrispondenza dell'espressione greca (*en sōmati sarkos autou*) con la tipica espressione ebraica, che Lv 18 usava per bandire i matrimoni giudicati «incestuosi», e che doveva poi comparire, proprio tale e quale (*bišē'er bēšārō*), in CD VII 1.

<sup>(24)</sup> In IV 17 – V 10 (il passo esaminato sopra, ai punti 2 e 3) vengono richiamate esplicitamente soltanto alcune forme particolari di unioni coniugali, quelle su cui occorre insistere maggiormente, poiché «Israele» le considerava legittime (*mišpāt*, «giustizia»), la Comunità invece illegittime (*zēnūt*, «prostituzione»). Questa *zēnūt*, quindi, copre probabilmente *per modum unius* le prime tre categorie della lista data in n. 13.

belli, e si sono rotolati nei sentieri della prostituzione (*bdrky znwt*)<sup>(25)</sup> e della ricchezza iniqua (*wbhwn rš'h*)». L'accostamento di *zēnūt* e *hon*, già incontrato sopra (in IV 17: sono due delle tre «reti») permette di intendere questa «prostituzione» alla medesima stregua dei precedenti casi<sup>(26)</sup>.

Non diversamente mi pare vada inteso il termine *porneia* (il vocabolo greco che comunemente traduce l'ebraico *zēnūt*) in Tb 8,7<sup>(27)</sup>, uno scritto giudaico ascrivibile grosso modo alla medesima epoca del CD<sup>(28)</sup>. Vi si legge che il giovane sposo, nell'accingersi a consumare il matrimonio, invoca la clemenza divina, confessando:

*Ou [S: ouchi] dia porneian egō lambanō tēn adelfēn mou tautēn, all'e-p'alētheias* (codd. B, A e s).

Non per «prostituzione» io prendo questa mia sorella, ma secondo «Verità».

Rosso Ubigli intende: non per il piacere, bensì per la riproduzione<sup>(29)</sup>. Ritengo sia più appropriato intendere invece: non per una congiunzione illegittima, bensì secondo la Legge rivelata.

Ci sono due buone ragioni per ritenere che questo fosse il senso originario. La prima è contenutistica: il problema matrimoniale di Sara (sette successivi mariti che muoiono prima ancora che la giovane pervenga a consumare il matrimonio con loro) finalmente si sblocca tramite le nozze con Tobia: non perché a un intento lussuoso dei primi sette sposi si sostituisca un intento riproduttivo dell'ottavo, ma perché questo ottavo (Tobia), quale parente più stretto, ha un diritto prioritario a prendere la giovane ereditiera in moglie<sup>(30)</sup>. La seconda ragione è linguistica, e riguarda il significato della coppia di espressioni contrapposte *dia porneian* ed *ep'alētheias*. L'*alētheia*, che Tobia professa qui di mettere in pratica, non va confusa con una «verità» teorica, né con una legge di natura, ma va identificata con la sacra Legge, nella fattispecie quella matrimoniale e secondo l'interpretazione rigorista di questi settari<sup>(31)</sup>. Sembra necessario dedurne: la contrapposta *por-*

<sup>(25)</sup> Leggendo col MS B (= XIX 17); il MS A (= VIII 5) ha *znwt*: verosimile ulteriore testimonianza di doppia ortografia per il medesimo termine (cf. sopra, note 16 e 22).

<sup>(26)</sup> In un passo contenuto nei nuovi frammenti 4QD, cui accenna BAUMGARTEN, «The Laws of the Damascus Document», 54, si leggerebbe una norma che fa divieto al padre di dare sua figlia «to an incompatible husband, which would be tantamount to plowing with animals of different species (Deut 22:10)». Saremmo ancora una volta nell'ampia casistica delle trasgressioni «matrimoniali» sussunte nella categoria *zēnūt*.

<sup>(27)</sup> Il passo è stato felicemente richiamato (ma, forse, meno felicemente interpretato) da Rosso UBIGLI, «Il Documento di Damasco», 5-6.

<sup>(28)</sup> Del libro di Tobia sono stati recuperati nelle grotte di Qumran frammenti di 4 MSS aramaici e di 1 MS ebraico.

<sup>(29)</sup> Questa interpretazione si muove sulla linea della Volgata, che traduce (o meglio, a suo modo parafrasa): *non luxuriae causa accipio sororem meam coniugem, sed sola posteritatis dilectione*. Già forse in tale senso aveva inteso la *Vetus latina*, che traduce: *non luxuriae causa accipio uxorem sororem meam, sed ipsa veritate*.

<sup>(30)</sup> Per la legge mosaica sulle ereditiere, Nm 36; cf. Tb 3,15-17; 6,10-19. Non è da escludere però che il buon diritto matrimoniale di Tobia nei confronti di Sara, a differenza dei precedenti pretendenti, venga (anche) considerato in base al fatto che egli soltanto risponde ai requisiti della normativa endogamica. Cf. Tb 4,12 e sopra, n. 13, punto a.

<sup>(31)</sup> Già negli scritti biblici più tardivi si trova l'identificazione fra Torah e Veri-

neia, che contestualmente Tobia dichiara di evitare, non va confusa con una generica lussuria, bensì identificata con l'insieme delle trasgressioni alla legge matrimoniale<sup>(32)</sup>. Il fedele attesta di agire «secondo Verità», di accingersi alla congiunzione coniugale legittima, con la moglie legittima; non già di agire «per prostituzione», avendo in animo di compiere una congiunzione illegittima, con una moglie illegittima<sup>(33)</sup>.

A conferma di questa interpretazione della contrapposizione porneia/alētheia di Tb 8,7 si possono addurre alcuni passi di scritti giudaici conosciuti a Qumran: 1QS I 5-6 e Test. Levi (aramaico) col. b, 14-17.

(1) Nelle prime righe della Regola della Comunità (1QS I 5-6)<sup>(34)</sup> vengono stabilite le direttive fondamentali di condotta, che i membri debbono seguire. Tra le altre, «di fare verità, giustizia e diritto (*'ēmet ūṣēdāqāh ūmī-špāt*) nel paese, e di non camminare più nella durezza di un cuore colpevole e di occhi di prostituzione (*wē'ēnē zēnūt*)». Più avanti (1QS III 18-19 e IV 10) si parla dei due «spiriti della verità e dell'ingiustizia» (*rūhōt hā'ēmet wēhā'āwel*), e al secondo si ascrivono, tra l'altro, «le opere abominevoli compiute in spirito di prostituzione (*bērūah zēnūt*)».

(2) Nel Test. Levi (aramaico) col. b, 14-17<sup>(35)</sup> Isacco esorta il nipote Levi: «E ora, figlio mio, ti mostrerò la norma della verità (*dyn qwšt' / tēn*

tà: MI 2,6: *tōrat 'ēmet / nomos alētheias*; Sal 119 (118),142: *tōrātēkā 'ēmet / ho nomos sou alētheia*. Su questo significato di *'ēmet* a Qumran, cf. J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, «La 'Verité' chez saint Paul et à Qumran», *RB* 72 (1965) 29-76 (specie 33-35). Che l'*alētheia* di Tb 8,7 alluda alla Legge divinamente rivelata tramite Mosè lo confermano Tb 1,3 e 7,12-13.

<sup>(32)</sup> Le versioni ebraica e aramaica di Tobia (cf. A. NEUBAUER, *The Book of Tobit. A Chaldee Text* [Oxford 1878] xxxviii, 12,29-30) portano, *ad locum*, rispettivamente: *lznwt / kdt mšh* (= «per prostituzione» / «secondo la legge di Mosè») e *lznwt / khlkt 'wryt'* (= «per prostituzione» / «secondo la *halakah* della Torah»). È vero che, con ogni probabilità, si tratta di due retroversioni tardive (cf. F. ZIMMERMANN, *The Book of Tobit* [New York 1958] 34-35, 133-138); adducono pur sempre una riprova circa la marcata corrispondenza tra la coppia *dia porneian / ep'alētheias* di Tb 8,7 e la coppia *lznwt / kmšpt* del nostro frammento 4QD, e costituiscono un utile richiamo a riflettere sul reale contenuto semantico di questa contrapposizione, originariamente pensata in ambiente giudaico palestinese e scritta in lingua semitica.

<sup>(33)</sup> Particolarmente istruttivo sembra il ricollegare Tb 8,7 a Tb 4,12 (una delle raccomandazioni rivolte a Tobia dal padre): *proseche seautq, paidion, apo pasēs porneias kai gynaika prōton labe apo tou spermatos tōn paterōn sou; mē labēs gynaikan allotrian, hē ouk estin ek tēs fylēs tou patros sou ... Nōe, Abraam, Isaak, Iakōb hoi pateres hēmōn apo tou aiōnos mnēsthēti, paidion, hoti houtoi pantes elabon gynaikas ek tōn adelfōn autōn...*, «guardati, figliolo, da ogni (forma di) prostituzione, e anzitutto prendi moglie dalla discendenza dei tuoi padri; non prendere (in moglie) una donna estranea, che non sia della tribù di tuo padre... Ricordati di Noè, di Abramo, di Isacco, di Giacobbe, nostri padri dei tempi più remoti, i quali tutti presero mogli di tra i loro fratelli...». Cf. 11QTemple 57,15-19: «Non prenderà moglie di tra tutte le figlie delle nazioni, bensì dal casato di suo padre prenderà moglie per sé, dal clan di suo padre (*mbyt 'byhw... mmsphh 'byhw*)...; e se essa muore, se ne potrà prendere un'altra del casato di suo padre, dal suo clan (*mbyt 'byhw mmsphwtw*)».

<sup>(34)</sup> Si veda ora E. QIMRON, *The Community Rule*, *The Dead Sea Scroll* (supervised by M. SEKINE) (Tokio 1979) 112-132.

<sup>(35)</sup> È un passo del MS proveniente dalla gueniza del Cairo e conservato alla Bodleian Library di Oxford: R. H. CHARLES-A. E. COWLEY, «An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs», *JQR* 19 (1906/1907) 566-583; J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, «Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the

*krisin tēs alētheias*). Anzitutto guardati, figlio mio, da ogni dissolutezza e impurità, e da ogni prostituzione (*mn kl phz wtm'h umn kl znwt*<sup>(36)</sup> / *apo pantos synousiasmou kai apo pasēs akatharsias kai apo pasēs porneias*), e prenditi una moglie dal mio clan (*mn mšpḥty* / *apo tou spermatos*; testo greco corrotto) e non profanare il tuo seme con prostitute (*m zny'n* / *meta pollōn*; testo greco corrotto: *pollōn* per *pornōn*)»<sup>(37)</sup>. Si vedano anche 4Q 213<sup>(38)</sup> e *T. Levi* (greco) IX 9-10.

Chiediamoci, in conclusione, quali contributi possa addurre questa norma penale 4QD (nell'interpretazione ora proposta), in rapporto alle questioni esegetiche che hanno attinenza con *zēnūt/porneia*. Ne intravedo cinque, cui in questa sede basti fare un breve accenno.

Il primo: una conferma, e cioè che in ambito giudaico questo termine ha assunto anche, nell'uso giuridico, una valenza tecnica, designa un reato.

Il secondo: una precisazione, e cioè che, all'interno di questo linguaggio specialistico, il termine serve a designare non già diversi reati, ma un unico reato, quello di rapporti coniugali con la propria moglie illegittima. Molteplici e diverse erano le prescrizioni di Legge che vietavano, ciascuna a un suo proprio titolo, il coniugio tra due persone (in altri termini: che stabilivano la illegittimità di una moglie); contraddistinte tuttavia da un tratto comune e unificante, quello di conferire rilevanza penale alla deliberata consumazione o prosecuzione del matrimonio illegittimo. Sembra quindi appropriato parlare di diversi tipi del reato *zēnūt/porneia* soltanto in relazione ai diversi titoli di illegittimità della moglie. In tal senso si tratta, effettivamente, di una categoria criminosa assai ampia.

Il terzo: una correzione, e cioè che né i matrimoni «misti», né quelli «incestuosi», né quelli «poligamici», né quelli a seguito di divorzio (né, tanto meno, il divorzio stesso), né quelli (protratti) con la propria moglie adultera<sup>(39)</sup> sono, propriamente parlando, *zēnūt/porneia*; lo sono, invece, i

Geniza», *RB* 86 (1979) 214-230; BEYER, *Die aramäische Texte*, 197-198; tale passo è comparabile con l'aggiunta a *T. Levi* (greco) XVIII 2, presente anch'essa nel MS e: R. H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford 1908; ristampa, Hildesheim 1960), 247; M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden 1978), 46.

<sup>(36)</sup> *znwt* [sic]: in ebraico; ci si sarebbe attesi *znw*, in aramaico.

<sup>(37)</sup> Contrariamente a BEYER, *Die aramäische Texte*, *ad locum*, non penso che il testo aramaico richieda di correggere *zny'n*, «prostitute», con *zr'n*, «straniere». In quanto illegittime come mogli, le straniere — e parimenti altre donne ancora — sono giuridicamente delle «prostitute» (cf. sopra, n. 22).

<sup>(38)</sup> Nel frammento aramaico del *Test. Levi* 4Q 213 Levi prega: «Mio Signore... [dammi di seguire tutti i] sentieri della verità (*rḥt qṣṭ*). Allontana [da me...] la malvagità e la prostituzione (*rḥq...[b]'yš' wznwt'*) (*kai porneian kai ybrin apostrepson ap'e-mou*)». Si vedano: J. T. MILIK, «Le Testament de Lévi en araméen», *RB* 62 (1955) 398-406; BEYER, *Die aramäische Texte*, 193; EISENMAN-WISE, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 137. Per le integrazioni col testo greco, cf. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments*, 29; DE JONGE, *The Testaments*, 25.

<sup>(39)</sup> Dovrebbe essere ormai chiaro che, in questo ambito linguistico tecnico-giuridico, una cosa è «adulterio» (*ni'ūpīm/moicheia*), altra cosa «prostituzione» (*zēnūt/porneia*). Queste due coppie di termini designano entrambe rapporti sessuali illegittimi; ma la prima quelli avuti con la moglie altrui, la seconda quelli avuti con la moglie propria «che non è secondo la Legge». Tra i due reati esiste un punto di connessione: l'«adulterio» (reale o presunto) della propria moglie legittima trasfor-

rapporti coniugali che costituiscono consumazione o prosecuzione dell'uno o dell'altro di questi matrimoni giudicati illegittimi.

Il quarto: una soluzione, e cioè che la *vexata quaestio* circa il senso delle clausole matteane (*parektos logou porneias*, Mt 5,32; *mē epi porneia*, Mt 19,9), se cioè la cd «eccezione» (meglio: precisazione limitativa) circa il divieto di divorziare faccia riferimento ai matrimoni incestuosi o all'adulterio risulta mal posta: nell'ambiente giudaico dell'epoca, matrimoni incestuosi e adulterio (della moglie) vengono riconosciuti entrambi, ciascuno a suo modo e assieme ad altri, titoli che costituiscono causa di illegittimità matrimoniale, condizione giuridicamente rilevante al fine di qualificare *zēnūt/porneia* i rapporti sessuali tra questi coniugi. Il senso delle clausole quindi pare il seguente: il divieto al divorzio — ovviamente<sup>(40)</sup> — non si estende, non va applicato, laddove un matrimonio, per ragioni antecedenti o successive alla sua stipulazione, vada giudicato illegittimo, e quindi anche illegittimi (*zēnūt/porneia*) i rapporti sessuali tra questi coniugi.

Il quinto: un'ipotesi, e cioè che alcune tra le ricorrenze di *pornē/pornai* del NT (non soltanto 1 Cor 6,15.16, ma anche Mt 21,31.32) potrebbero essere pure portatrici del senso tecnico-giuridico giudaico di *zōnāh/zōnôt* (= mogli illegittime).

P.za s. Giovanni in Laterano, 4  
I-00120 Roma

Angelo TOSATO

---

ma costei in moglie illegittima e rende «prostituzione» i rapporti sessuali che suo marito intrattenga con lei.

<sup>(40)</sup> È invalsa l'abitudine di vedere una contrapposizione tra il divieto di divorzio in Paolo, Marco e Luca e quello in Matteo: là un divieto assoluto, qui un divieto relativo (limitato da una «eccezione»); e di dibattere su quale tra loro abbia priorità, e di speculare sul valore della probabile aggiunta matteana. Mi pare che tutto ciò ruoti attorno a uno pseudo-problema: la diversità di formulazione (assoluta/relativa) di una norma non implica necessariamente una diversità del suo contenuto. Il primo evangelista, con ogni verosimiglianza, non introduce una «eccezione», ma soltanto esplicita un limite incluso in quel divieto, impedendone interpretazione e applicazione false (fondamentaliste). Cf. i rilievi svolti in «On Genesis 2:24», *CBQ* 52 (1990) 405, n.43.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Yehoshua GITAY, *Isaiah and his Audience*. The Structure and Meaning of Isaiah 1–12 (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 30). Assen, Van Gorcum, 1991. ix-283 p. 24 × 16,5. Df 149,50

This work promises much but is disappointing in execution. Gitay here continues his earlier studies of rhetoric and audience response in the prophetic books (for Isaiah see specifically “The Effectiveness of Isaiah’s Speech”, *JQR* 75 [1984] 162-172). G. wishes to explore the relationships among speaker, audience and text in the first twelve chapters of Isaiah (6); his emphasis is on the intention of the prophet Isaiah as a rhetorician and the reaction of his audience. But the work is marred both by the mechanics of G.’s presentation and by the lens with which he analyses these chapters.

Because the mechanics loom so large, I will name them first. The text is reproduced from a camera-ready typescript which exhibits too many careless errors, particularly in his notes and bibliography. He does not enclose the titles of articles in quotation marks, nor are all book titles italicized; contrariwise he sometimes italicizes the abbreviation of a series (“*SupVT*”, 277). Umlauts are missing altogether (“Gottingen”, “Beitrag”), and capitalization is not dependable. And there are outright errors: the sophist Gorgias is cited as “Georgias” (240), and the German poet and dramatist is cited as “J. W. Goether” (259). Richard J. Clifford is cited as “R. J. Cliford” (243), Marcus Jastrow as “Jastrov” (249), Albert B. Lord as “B. A. Lord” (275), and Amos N. Wilder as “A. N. Widler” (278). The divine appellative Elyon is twice cited in a book-title as “Eylon” (269, 275), and *Bibel* in a German title twice as “Bible” (241, 270). The chapters included in the third volume of Mitchell Dahood’s commentary on the Psalms are given as “101-105” instead of 101-150 (271). An essay of von Rad is cited as “The City of the Hill” instead of “The City on the Hill” (276). A blank is left on p.28 where a Hebrew word should have been inserted, and a blank on p.241 where “*CBQ*” should have been inserted. The section titled “The Fifth Address” is specified as “3:16-4:16” — there is, of course, no 4,16; and the section titled “The Tenth Address” is specified as “9:21-9:6” instead of 8,21-9,6 in both the Contents (v) and the beginning of the section itself (160). G. misquotes Gesenius-Kautzsch: in citing sec. 116a of that work, on the denotation of the participle, he writes “uninterruptive” instead of “uninterrupted” (44). With reference to 6,1 he states (117) that “King Ahaz died” rather than Uzziah. I must insist that such carelessness is not a

general characteristic of the series in which this work appears, as a comparison with number 28, published in 1990, makes clear.

Such carelessness, however, would matter less if the contents were lucid; alas, they are not. Sentence after sentence in this work needs remedy. Some phraseology gives the wrong impression entirely. G. writes, "The authors... are in pain in order to explain the function of the syntactic changes" (257), but the English idiom is "are at pains to explain" (or "take pains to explain"). Several times he uses the expression "a language" where it would be preferable to speak of "a style" or "a manner of speaking" (28, 29, 30, 42). One wonders what he has in mind in writing, "Nevertheless, the speeches which comprise the body of chapters 1-12 do not, as a whole, reflect consistent systematic volume" (11). I presume he means to write "a consistent systematic volume", or, better, "a consistent systematic written work". But what can one make of the sentence, "Isaiah's demands are to be perceived with cultic authority" (29)? Does he mean "as having cultic authority", or "as the equivalent of cultic authority", or something else? Or this: "Furthermore, it [the device of contradiction] contributes to the clarification of the concept by setting up class within which a distinction is being made, contributing significantly to the concepts by the rejected alternative" (44)? The whole work would have benefited from the firm hand of an editor whose mother tongue is English, particularly given G.'s effort to analyse the subtleties of Isaiah's Hebrew rhetoric.

I turn now to the lens used by G. to analyse Isaiah 1-12. Any study of the prophets is based on a set of assumptions: scholars who have worked on Isaiah in modern times have developed a whole network of assumptions about prophetic self-awareness, the modes of prophetic speech, the way in which oral material came to form written collections, and the like. G. uses a rather different set of assumptions in analysing the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, and these are not convincing, at least to me.

He begins with a declaration with which one could hardly disagree, namely, that Isaiah was a "great poet and a skillful orator" (vii). He then proceeds to view Isaiah's prophetic consciousness and prophetic activity through these roles, especially the latter. "My goal in this book is to demonstrate the prophetic art of effective speech" (ibid.). The role of orator moves G. to draw on the kind of rhetorical analysis that is set forth in Greek and Latin sources and in works from recent centuries that are based on such analysis. Thus he cites references to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, to the anonymous Latin *Rhetorica ad Herennium* from Cicero's time (for these see p. 240), and to Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* (256). Much is made of various figures of speech to which he applies the Greek (or less often Latin) names: epanaphora in 1,7 (242, note 44), aversio in 3,25 (83). Though G. draws on current scholarship on Isaiah, such as the commentaries of Otto Kaiser and Hans Wildberger, and many detailed studies, he prefers classical rhetorical analysis for his analytical tool rather than the modes now current in scholarship.

He proposes that the first twelve chapters of Isaiah consist of thirteen "addresses", which he delimits as follows: 1,2-20; 1,21-2,5; 2,6-22; 3,1-15; 3,16-4,6; 5,1-30; 6,1-13; 7,1-25; 8,1-20; 8,21-9,6; 9,7-10,4; 10,5-32; and 10,33-12,6.



Now some of these are certainly discourse units: no one doubts the unity of 6,1-13, and 7,1-25 is certainly some kind of unit, whether or not it has incorporated later expansion. With regard to 1,2-20, J.J.M. Roberts proposed a decade ago that these verses make up a single speech ("Form, Syntax, and Redaction in Isaiah 1:2-20", *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* New Series 3 [1982] 293-306, a study that G. cites). But the unity of some of the others is certainly open to challenge.

It is not clear whether G. assumes that these addresses are now arranged in chronological order, though he implies this more than once. On p.18 he states, "If the speeches of Isaiah are arranged in chronological order then the Syro-Ephraimite war, which took place during Ahaz's reign, is indeed, the war described in the first address": that is to say, the devastation in 1,4-9 cannot describe the Assyrian invasion of 701 (against Wildberger, for example). By the same token chapter 6 does not narrate the call of Isaiah (119); Isaiah's first-person reference "does not start with chapter 6" (118), given such references in 5,1.9 and 13, for example.

G. subdivides each of his thirteen proposed addresses into rhetorical sections, typically the five he labels "introduction", "statement of facts", "confirmation", "refutation" and "epilogue". For example, the subdivisions of his proposed second, third and fifth addresses (1,21-2,5; 2,6-22 and 3,16-4,6) are: introduction - 1,21a; 2,6a and 3,16-17 respectively; the statement of facts - 1,21b-23; 2,6b-8 and 3,18-23 respectively; confirmation - 1,24-28; 2,9-11 and 3,24-4,1 respectively; refutation - 1,29-31; 2,12-21 and 4,2-3 respectively; and epilogue - 2,1-5; 2,22 and 4,4-6 respectively. But questions abound. Why is 2,21 divided between two sections? — surely "filled with justice, righteousness dwelt in her midst" in v.21b expands on "faithful city" in v.21a. If there is any shift at all, it comes in v.22. Again, as G. himself affirms (38), "faithful city" in v.21a is reaffirmed in v.26b, surely an inclusio; if that is the case, then v.27 moves out into something new rather than continuing his "confirmation". But G. minimizes any shift in tone between v.26 and v.27: "The switch from the direct approach to the third person singular feminine in v.27, should not disturb the reading" (47). Again, the superscription in 2,1 surely suggests a new beginning rather than the conclusion of an address that begins in chapter 1. But G. bypasses the problem; he merely states, "The heading is not a mark of an independent collection. The heading has a clear rhetorical function, and the language 'Isaiah the son of Amoz' and not 'I', provides an authority" (41).

And how can one justify taking 3,18-23 as a part of Isaiah's original discourse (G.'s "statement of facts")? He writes, "How does Isaiah try to reach his audience? He uses a simple technique. He avoids a detailed description, instead, he outlines in three long sentences a tremendous list — with no further comment — of jewelry and decoration. The numerous details are designed to create a notion of reality.... The longer the list, the better the notion of reality is perceived" (81-82). One may admit that Isaiah can use lists (2,13-16; 3,2-3) and still not grant that a list without any internal groupings, a bare "shopping list", is anything more than a

grotesquely long gloss. What, one wonders, is the identity of the “three long sentences” of which he affirms these six verses consist?

With regard to the general question of the variety that is possible within a single prophetic utterance, one may certainly affirm that a prophet made use of (and modified) a variety of genres, and the shift between these genres brought shifts in vocabulary and to some degree in style as well. And, it must be added, given our own distance from the prophets, it is notoriously difficult to pinpoint what “style” consists of anyway. But there are limits. In his assumption of the genuineness to Isaiah of Jerusalem of 4,3-6, G. writes, “Is it possible then that such different styles could appear in a single discourse? The question of the text’s authorship concerning a non-homogeneous style has again been discussed lately. Analyzing the literary model of the Temple scroll, and studying the practice of ancient Near Eastern scribes, pointing in both cases to the phenomenon of inconsistent style, scholars have concluded that inconsistency in style is not an indication of distinct authorship, but rather an intentional literary creation” (77). But both the Temple scroll and the works of ancient Near Eastern scribes were written, literary constructions, not the deposit of oracles that were first delivered orally in the perception that they came at divine initiative. I shall return to this matter below.

First, however, let me affirm that in the course of his analysis G. isolates many nice instances of rhetorical effects, particularly of alliteration and the like. He points out the repeated sequences of  $z + r$  in 1,4-7 (28), the repeated  $s$  in 1,22 (44) and the  $\dot{s} + r$  and  $s + r$  in the first phrase of 1,23 (45); he points out the chiasmic arrangement of verbs in 5,8a (100-101). But one is less convinced by his explanations of what Isaiah intends by these effects and of how the prophet’s audience reacts to them. In his analysis of 1,21 (44) he states, “The pairing of *zwnh* and *n'mnh* (‘faithful’) is not just unusual; the contrast is so sharp that there is no need for further elaboration. However, one can assume that this sharp unexpected contradiction might raise opposition or even rejection in the audience, at least at first hearing. To offset this, the prophet creates an easy tune, readily perceived by the audience, by utilizing the devices of *assonance* and *alliteration*, i.e. the correlation of sound: *'ykh - hyth - zwnh - qryh - n'mnh*”. By his underlining of single consonants in the Hebrew letters I presume he refers to the recurrent closing syllable *-â* (twice *-nâ*). But one wants to raise questions. How could Isaiah avoid such an “easy tune” if he is using feminine metaphors, given feminine endings? His only alternative at this point would have been *îr* instead of *qiryâ*, equally feminine but without *-â* (compare v.26), but most of the “easy tune” would remain. And how can we be sure that the “easy tune” is to “offset” the shock of the collocation of *zônâ* and *ne'êmûnâ*? And: one may presume “opposition” and “rejection” in the audience, but that is only a presumption on our part. The address of the people as “Sodom” and “Gomorraah” in v.10 might be thought to be equally shocking, but “the function of the reference to Sodom and Gomorraah in v.10” is “to manipulate his audience. Sodom and Gomorraah are the symbols of sin and corruption. This sharp language intends to put the objects of Isaiah’s attack in an immediate, defensive

position" (30). G.'s conclusions about Isaiah's intention and his audience response appear imprecise and lacking any control.

Now let me return to the prophets' perception that the oracles they delivered came at God's initiative. In his Introduction (5), G. cites Plato's distinction (in the *Timaeus*) between two types of prophets, the mantic and the declarer. G. states, "Isaiah does not portray himself through his speeches as an ecstatic figure but rather as a man in command of his thoughts as well as his means of expression" (ibid.). I pass by the question whether Isaiah offers any clues at all about himself through his speeches; I simply submit that G. has allowed Plato to lead him into a false dichotomy. Even when we are anthropologically precise about what we mean by "ecstatic", there is no way to determine the extent to which the various pre-exilic prophets were ecstatic (one thinks of works that have grappled with the problem, like Johannes Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* [Oxford 1962], or Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* [Philadelphia 1980]). But what is abundantly clear from the deposit of prophetic oracles that have come down to us is the prophets' sense of compulsion to mediate the word of God, so that, whether or not from the point of view of our analysis they were "in command" of their "thoughts" in the way classical orators were, the prophets were utterly persuaded that their words were not their own. And that self-perception needs to be taken seriously, because it has consequences for our mode of analysis of prophetic literature, in this instance of Isaiah's. Of course it is obvious that we cannot specify beforehand what shape will be taken by an utterance perceived to come from the mouth of God, but an analysis that continually insists on the deliberate and intentional use by the prophet of various rhetorical devices in order to achieve a specific effect on his audience may be wide of the mark.

Let me illustrate the problem from another realm altogether. Franz Schubert, in the course of his short lifetime of thirty-one years, composed orchestral works, piano works, chamber music and hundreds of songs; the Deutsch catalog lists almost a thousand numbered works. Even writing out these works might seem to have taken up all his waking hours. Melody seems to have flowed from his pen. So, one could ask, how did this music come, seemingly so spontaneously? By contrast, we have many sketch books from Schubert's contemporary Ludwig van Beethoven: we can trace how he struggled to shape his thematic material. So, one could again ask, how did this music come? Was Beethoven more "intentional", was he more "in control", over the material he created, than Schubert was? Such questions, of the origin and nature of creativity, are hardly susceptible of meaningful answers.

By the same token I submit that the assumption that Isaiah was "in command of his thoughts" is not useful. What we have, after all, is written texts. These we can analyse. We cannot reconstruct Isaiah's intentionality with the same certainty, and we most emphatically cannot reconstruct his audience's response except in the most tentative fashion. G. has raised important issues, but I am not convinced by his answers.

210 Herrick Road  
Newton Centre, MA 02159 USA

William L. HOLLADAY

Reinhard Gregor KRATZ, *Kyros im Deuterjesaja-Buch*. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55 (Forschung zum Alten Testament 1). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991. x-254 p. 23 × 15,5. DM 148,—

Two approaches have dominated the study of Isaiah 40–55 in recent times. One school, impressed by the underlying unity of the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah, inquires about the role chaps. 40–55 play in the redaction of the whole. R. Rendtorff, B. Childs, C. Seitz, E. Conrad, and others tend to see Second Isaiah as the book's hermeneutical center, influencing the editing of the whole and interpreting themes of the book. Several influences are behind this approach: literary analysis, redaction criticism, canon criticism, and the new emphasis on "intertextuality". The other approach is sometimes termed "literary-critical", but it is more properly source-critical. It continues the traditional scholarly interest in the growth of prophetic books and in differentiating primary and secondary stages. For the Book of Isaiah, it is represented, among others, by K. Elliger, J. Vermeylen, K. Kiesow, R. Merendino, and by Kratz's *Habilitationsschrift*, accepted in 1990 by the University of Zurich. A solid monograph, the book is in dialogue with previous scholarship and argues in detail the thesis that chaps. 40–55 contain the literary record of the prophet's preaching and its successive interpretation. The volume is a fitting beginning to a new scholarly series, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*.

Amid the detailed textual analysis that fills most of the book, K. keeps a strong theological focus on the word of God and its continual actualization in the stages of the book's growth. The author underlines the continuity between the inner-biblical interpretation preserved within Deutero-Isaiah and the interpretation that occurred after the closing of the canon, such as that of the Septuagint and Targum. Unlike many *literaturkritik* scholars, K. shows a positive appreciation of the additions to the original text.

Starting points are highly important in the study of ancient literature. K.'s starting point consists of two observations: chaps. 40–55 show *compositional* unity (e.g., chaps. 40–48 and 49–55 are sections, 40,1-11 and chap. 55 form a frame); the sayings units (rather than the redactional passages) contain inconsistencies if not contradictions, e.g., major themes of the first section of the book such as creation, the nations, old and new, and especially the unicity of God, recede in the second part (after 49,14). The most puzzling disharmony, however, is the fact that the exiles who set out in chaps. 40–48 are called by the old terms Jacob and Israel but return in 49–54 as the children of Zion, the wife and bride of God. These are not simply changes of perspective but fundamentally different concepts; one is concerned with the twelve tribes and renewal of the divine acts of resettling and repopulating the land, whereas the other is concerned with the restoration and repopulating of devastated Jerusalem, in which tradition alone the metaphors of wife and children are at home. How did these and other distinct themes and perspectives come together in one book? K. refuses to seek an ersatz unity by attributing everything to a single author

or by simply accepting the present text as a starting point. He rejects the latter strategy on the grounds that "the canonical *Endgestalt* is not the solution but precisely the problem of exegesis" (10). His solution is a diachronic investigation into the composition of chaps. 40–55.

Other scholars will not be disposed to use as evidence for diverse authorship the appearance and disappearance of topics within the book and the juxtaposition of distinct traditions. Different aims of the speeches and different audiences explain the use and non-use of themes. And traditions such as those of Jacob-Israel and Zion as wife of Yahweh and mother of a city's inhabitants, though they may have had a distinct origin, would surely have been long associated by the sixth century BC. Jerusalem was too small a place for religious traditions to remain in watertight compartments.

Disposed to find strata in Second Isaiah, K. takes 45,1-7 as an exemplary text because of its centrality and link with two other key texts, 44,24-28 and 45,8-13. First, he determines the unit, analyses its structure (*Aufbau*), and explores the hints of disunity he discovers within it. He then fits the various strata of the particular text into his theory of the growth of the book.

Determining the unit, so important (and so difficult) in Second Isaiah, is done largely by the criteria of logical and syntactical consistency. 45,1 is judged to begin a new unit rather than continue 44,24-28, as many commentators think. The messenger formula ("Thus says Yahweh") of 45,1 could not possibly have been the original continuation of 44,24-28, since the messenger formula of 44,24a addresses the people as "you" and 44,28 addresses Cyrus as "he", whereas 45,1 (and the statements it introduces in vv. 2-7) refers to Cyrus both in the second and third person.

Shift of grammatical persons is an important criterion for K. in determining different authors. He will use it again in judging 45,1b to be secondary. The criterion, however, is problematic, since mixing of first, second, and third person address is a regular feature of Hebrew prose and poetry. Striking prose examples are 1 Sam 12,11 (MT) where Samuel refers to himself by name in the third person though he uses "I" elsewhere, and 2 Sam 7,18-19 where David begins his prayer by referring to himself in the first person before shifting to the third person. The poetry of Isaiah has many shifts of grammatical person: 1,29, third person plural verb followed by second person plural verbs; 3,1-4 and 10-12, shift from third to first person reference to God; 22,16 ("What right do you have here, and what kin do you have here that you have hewn out a tomb for yourself, O hewer of a tomb *for himself*, O carver of a dwelling in the rock *for himself*"); 23,3, from "you" to "her"; 25,12, from "their" to "your"; 42,20 (kethib) second person verb form within a string of third person verbs; 42,24, MT "we" within a group of third person forms; 48,2, third person verbs continue direct divine speech to Israel in the second person (just as in 45,1-2!); 52,14, "just as many were shocked at *you*", which then shifts to the third person; 64,3, "for those who wait for him" after the second person. The shifts may be caused by the intensely relational quality of the texts, which attends closely to the addressee. Surely all the shifts cannot be explained as secondary, for if Hebrew style demanded absolute consistency

in grammatical persons, redactors wishing to make seamless additions would surely have kept grammatical persons consistent. Despite its wide use as a criterion by source critics, shift of person is not a reliable guide for judging material to be secondary.

K.'s analysis of syntax and logic in 45,1-7 reveals a threefold structure: introduction (v. 1), first part (vv. 2-3), second part (vv. 4-5a), and third part (vv. 5b-7). Closer inspection of the three parts, however, disclose numerous repetitions (the repeated *qr' bšm* in vv. 3b and 4b, the exclusivity formula in 5a, 6b, and 7b, and *l'm'n t/yd'* in vv. 3b and 6a). Each of the three parts states the same thing with different purposes (suggested by the three-times repeated *l'ma'an* in vv. 3b, 4a, 6a). This leads to the conclusion that there are two perspectives hidden in the text, hence two strata: the basic document (*Grundschrift*) and a "Cyrus-supplementation" stratum. The basic document consists of 45,1 (up to *limšihô*), 2, 3 (minus *l'ma'an tēda*), 4, 6, 7. The Cyrus-supplementation consists of v. 1b (from *l'kôreš... yissā-gērû*), v. 3 (only *l'ma'an tēda*), and all of v. 5ab. The latter strand gives Cyrus prominence in himself and not merely in relation to the salvation being effected for Israel.

An illustration of K.'s method is his view that vv. 1 and 2 describe two originally distinct urban conquests. The description in v. 1 (after *limšihô*) differs from v. 2: "Instead of the violent conquest of vv. 2-3a, in which the walls are razed (*yšr piel*) and gate and metal bolt are destroyed (*šbr*, *gd'* both *piel*) so that the treasures within can be reached, a peaceful entry into the city in v. 1b, in which the "door leaves" (dual) of the gate simply swing wide (*pṭh*, *piel*), [and] all the gates are not even locked (*šgr*, *niphal*)" (26). V. 1b makes one read (the older) v. 2 differently from its original intent. The special nuance of v. 1b is that "[n]either YHWH nor Cyrus... are credited with being conquerors of a fortified city defending itself; rather both seem to be welcomed into the cities of the defeated 'peoples and kings' (v. 1a)" (26). The reviewer is skeptical, however, that the two verses say different things. Surely, it is more natural to take v. 1 as the commission of Cyrus as Yahweh's agent, and v. 2 as the promise to him of treasures, hidden or stored (where else?) in temples and palaces within cities. One of the difficulties in K.'s interpretation of 45,1-7 is caused by his artificial separation of 44,24-28, which speaks of creation, from 45,1-7. The separation obscures the traditional ancient connection between the gods' creation and their commission of the king. That connection is attested in the Bible (e.g., Psalm 89) and in Mesopotamia. Several well known Mesopotamian texts connect the commission of the king and divine creation of the world, as does Isa 44,24-45,7: the Seleucid prayer "When Anu created the heavens" (in *ANET* 141-142); a prayer to dedicate the foundation brick of a temple, and the Chaldean Cosmogony (in J. Bottéro and S.N. Kramer, *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme: Mythologie Mésopotamienne* [Paris 1989] 491-93, 497-502); and the Mayer text (in *Or* 56 [1987] 55-68).

After his examination of 45,1-7, K. analyses (in Section B, 36-147) all the Cyrus texts: 41,1-5.21-29; 46,9-11; 44,24-28; 45,9-13; 48,12-15, and 42,5-9 with the "servant songs". They confirm the multiple sources found

in 45,1-7. The section shows the development of such themes as the nations, conceptions of time, the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, the exile and return, creation, and the servant of Yahweh.

The Cyrus passages reveal a pattern of additions to the basic document. They, and other strata, fit into one of the five strata that K. postulates for chaps. 40–48 (not to mention a few *späte Einzelzusätze*). He dates each stratum and identifies its ideology. The first stage, as has been mentioned, is the basic document, the transcription of the prophetic preaching, soon after 539 BC (40,1-5 [prologue].\*12-17.\*21-31; 41,\*1-5.\*8-20.\*21-29; 42,10-13.14-16; 43,1-4.9-13.14-15.16-21.\*22-28; 44,1-4.6-8.21-23; 44,24-26a; 45,\*1-7.20a.21; 46,9-11; \*47; 48,20-21, and 52,7-10 [epilogue]). Discernible behind the *Grundschrift* are two phases of early prophetic preaching: discussion and words of weal; judgments of the nations. The second stage is the development of the theme of Zion in chaps. \*49–54 (e.g., \*51,9). Third is the “Cyrus supplementation” of c. 520-515 BC. The fourth is concerned with idols, from late in the era of Darius. The fifth stage is the “Ebed-Israel” level, from the first half or middle of the fifth century BC (41,[6]9-11[?], 42,8-9.17.18-25; 43,5-7.8; 44,5.26a; 45,8-10.11b.19.24-25; 46,1-4.8.12-13; 48,1-11.16.17-19; 49,3.7-13. etc.).

The book is to be commended for a refreshing skepticism about the unity of chaps. 40–55, and for an often acute examination of particular passages. One is constantly forced to rethink familiar interpretations and assumptions. But the thesis that chaps. 40–48 reflect successive interpretations of a basic document, at least in the form proposed, is not sustained, in the judgment of this reviewer. K.’s initial observations about the inconsistency of Second Isaiah’s message are open to serious question and upon that fragile foundation a considerable speculative edifice has been erected. Criteria for judging sources such as shift of grammatical person are not reliable. One indication of the uncertainty of the reconstruction is the extraordinary diversity of opinion regarding the sources of chaps. 40–55 even among scholars who share K.’s source-critical methodology (Elliger and Vermeylen). Ancient Near Eastern texts are not necessarily shaped according to the rules of Western logic and syntax. K.’s theory further presumes ideological editing and precise splicing of new text to old, which are unparalleled in the ancient Near East. The most empirically verifiable ancient Near Eastern example of reworking literary texts is the Gilgamesh tradition, which has been well studied by Jeffrey Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia 1982). The successive reinterpretations and rewriting of the Gilgamesh tradition, however, have been done very differently from K.’s reconstruction.

Weston School of Theology  
Cambridge, MA 02140 USA

Richard J. CLIFFORD

Angelika STROTMANN, "*Mein Vater bist du!*" (*Sir 51,10*). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nicht-kanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 39). Frankfurt, Verlag Josef Knecht, 1991. xv-408 p. 22 × 15,5. DM 68,—

This important book began as a dissertation project on God as "father" in the New Testament. Instead it became a study of the idea of God's fatherhood in early Jewish literature. The texts that are analyzed do not form a homogeneous corpus, but range from the Books of Tobit and Ben Sira to the Qumran *Hodayot* and to the Prayer of Jacob. The latter is preserved only in a fourth-century copy published by Preisendanz among the Greek magical papyri. Excluded from consideration are not only the New Testament but also, for various reasons, Josephus, Philo, the Targumim, and all tannaitic literature. These limitations are regrettable, but more than understandable, given the present size of the tome.

Strotmann starts with a survey of the literature, under the programmatic title "Die Instrumentalisierung der Vaterschaft Gottes in frühjüdischen Schriften durch neutestamentliche Forschung" (3-19). She shows how the study of the designation of God as "father" in early Jewish literature has generally been used only as a prolegomenon and a (usually negative) foil for understanding the novelty and uniqueness of Jesus' use of the term *Abba*. This perspective, which gained wide currency especially through several works by Joachim Jeremias, continues to influence not only the field of New Testament exegesis, but also dogmatic theology and homiletics.

Among critical works, Strotmann lists mainly those by German scholars, but there has been considerable criticism of the approach represented by Jeremias elsewhere as well (e.g., G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* [London 1983] 39-43; J. Barr, "Abba Isn't Daddy", *JTS* 39 [1988] 28-47). For rabbinic literature there exists a recent study which is unfortunately not easily accessible and of which Strotmann was unaware (A. Goshen-Gottstein, *God and Israel as Father and Son in Tannaitic Literature* [diss. Jerusalem, Hebrew University 1986] in Hebrew, Engl. summary p.I-VIII). As far as the non-rabbinic early Jewish material is concerned, however, Strotmann's is indeed the first monograph on the subject of divine fatherhood.

The bulk of the book consists of a painstaking and detailed analysis of those passages where God is spoken of as "father". A brief outline of introductory problems concerning each separate work is given. Then each passage is set in its immediate and wider context. Text-critical as well as literary questions are addressed before an evaluation of the meaning of divine fatherhood in the particular text is attempted. The discussion of the single occurrence of God's fatherhood in the book of Tobit takes up thirty-five pages (24-58). This thoroughness does not always make for easy reading, but the effort is worthwhile. In the end one does come away with a clearer understanding of several nuances of the father image provided by



the context. Unfortunately, though aware of their existence, Strotmann was unable to consult the unpublished Aramaic and Hebrew fragments of Tobit (26, n. 14). Besides Tobit, Part A treats the other two deuterocanonical books in which God is spoken of as "father". A long section is devoted to Ben Sira (59-97), the Hebrew text of which provided the title of the book. Of the Book of Wisdom, only the three passages referring to God as "father" are treated in detail, whereas the seventeen passages speaking of Israel or of individuals as God's sons or children are discussed more briefly.

Part B (143-226) deals with apocalyptic texts among the pseudepigrapha (*Apocryphon of Ezekiel, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Job, Testament of Abraham*). In Part C all other texts that fall under the category of pseudepigrapha are treated (*Jubilees, Joseph and Aseneth, Life of Adam and Eve, 3 Maccabees, Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets, and a Prayer of Jacob*). In the last main part (D) extrabiblical Qumran texts are analyzed (1QH, 4QDibHam<sup>a</sup>).

A final chapter analyzes and summarizes the results. Even though God is called "father" most frequently in the context of prayer, he is addressed only seven times in a vocative form (362). The beneficiaries of God's fatherhood are quite diverse: the people of Israel and every individual Israelite, the righteous, the poor, individuals in distress, the first high priest, Job, the daughters of Job, Abraham, Aseneth, the *Metanoia*, orphans and proselytes, the patriarchs, the sons of truth, Adam and Eve, the archangel Michael, all humankind, all creatures, all of creation (364). Strotmann's primary concern however lies neither with the grammatical form nor the genre in which God's fatherhood appears, nor even with the "addressees" of his fatherhood. She rather concentrates on the connotations of what his being "father" means. Certainly his absolute power over creation is variously expressed. His relationship to his sons/children sometimes takes the form of a stern discipline. At other times the emphasis is on his unfailing protection and assistance. The most prominent connotations however are his mercy and especially his fidelity. In this perspective, the grammatical form of the references to God as "father" (which she nevertheless analyzes quite diligently) is of considerably less importance than has been the case in most studies on the subject.

The volume closes with a detailed bibliography (381-397) and indices of passages cited and of modern authors (399-408). Misprints are very few, in the Hebrew and Greek as well as in the German text. The first line of p. 210 repeats the last line of the preceding page. On p. 189, bTaan 3,6 should read mTaan 3,8.

Strotmann cites most texts in Greek or Hebrew from the best available editions. She acknowledges her debt to Charlesworth's English edition of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (OTP). In a few cases however she was able to use more recent critical editions. For the *Testament of Abraham* (F. Schmidt 1986) this yielded an additional text, one in which the archangel Michael calls God "my father" (TestAbr B VII.20). Strotmann did not see VanderKam's new edition of *Jubilees* (1989), nor of course his publication of some of the Hebrew fragments from Qumran. Two of the fragments contain texts she discusses, although the wording for "father" and "son"

is contained only in the reconstructed readings of *Jub* 1,28 and 2,20, not in the actual fragments (VanderKam–Milik, *JBL* 110 [1991] 244–245, 256, 266; cf. *Bib* 73 [1992] 62–83). These fragments can at least confirm Strotmann's supposition (244, against Charles) that *Jub* 1,28 did not follow immediately after 1,25. For the father concept in *Joseph and Aseneth* one might add a recent article to Strotmann's bibliography (P. Dschulnigg, "Gleichnis vom Kind, das zum Vater flieht [JosAs 12,8]", *ZNW* 80 [1989] 269–271).

One problem Strotmann is constantly faced with is that of which texts to include and which ones to exclude. In many instances, the text is not clearly established either because of the fragmentary state of the manuscripts (Qumran) or because of manuscript variants (e.g. Ben Sira, *Testament of Job*, *Testament of Abraham*, *Life of Adam and Eve*). Equally complicated are the questions of date and of Jewish provenance. Concerning the former, Strotmann is quite lenient. She includes e.g. the *Prayer of Jacob*, which may fall considerably out of her time frame of 200 BC to 135 AD. Concerning the latter, she tends to be rather strict, excluding all texts for which Christian influence may reasonably be suspected. Thus she excludes from her study the references to God as "father" in the *Odes of Solomon*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Testament of Isaac*, and two suspected interpolations (pace de Jonge) in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In several doubtful cases she follows the great majority of scholars in positing a Jewish origin (*Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, *Testament of Job*).

The exclusion of the *Sibylline Oracles* which use the terms γενέτης (LSJ: *begetter, ancestor; father*) or παγγενέτωρ (LSJ: *father of all*) instead of πατήρ can be justified on the basis of the criteria determined for the limits of this study, but lays itself open to the same criticism Strotmann makes against others, namely that specific language is overly emphasized (cf. 18). It would have been useful to compare the references to πατήρ τῶν πάντων and similar ones (361) with the analogous passages in the *Sibylline Oracles*. Citation of these passages (9, n.38) should be corrected to "Geffcken... III, 278 ...".

Other texts that one would have liked to see discussed are *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 16,5, where the sons of Korah claim *Pater nos non genuit, sed Fortissimus nos plasmavit. Et nunc si ambulaverimus in viis eius, erimus filii sui* (ed. Harrington, SC 229). This is apparently one of the few passages where God's fatherhood is conceived of as conditional upon human behavior, whereas usually it is considered an irrevocable gift (373–374).

Several of Strotmann's texts echo 2 Sam 7,14 ("I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me"). Therefore the Midrash on this verse in 4QFlor 1-2 i 11-12 which refers to the divine sonship of a Davidic messianic figure deserved inclusion. The theme of God's disciplining Israel as a father disciplines his child also recurs in the Psalms of Solomon (18,4; 13,9).

With or without these additional texts Strotmann has furthered our understanding of the different dimensions of divine fatherhood in early Jewish literature. Her study is admirable, outstanding for its disciplined analysis of over fifty texts, in their context. They are often not easy to

interpret, but Strotmann bravely tackles text criticism and literary and redactional problems with an open mind. Her feminist sensitivity makes her see nuances that might otherwise be overlooked (see, e.g., 347-352). She is willing to admit uncertainty where it is warranted after careful evaluation of the evidence.

At least one uncertainty has been laid to rest since the publication of Strotmann's study. Whereas even fairly recently no less an authority than Joseph A. Fitzmyer was able to reaffirm the basic correctness of Jeremias' statement that "there is as yet no evidence in the literature of ancient Palestinian Judaism that 'my Father' is used as a personal address to God" ("Abba and Jesus' Relation to God", *À cause de l'Évangile*. FS J. Dupont [LD 123; Paris 1985] 28), the missing evidence — if one does not consider Sir 51,10 sufficiently close — has finally appeared. A recently published text (E. Schuller, "4Q372: A Text About Joseph", *RevQ* 14 [1990] 352-355, 362-363; cf. *CBQ* 54 [1992] 75-79) includes a prayer that begins אבי ואלי אל תעזבני ביד הגוים ("My father and my God, do not abandon me into the hand of the nations"). A similar text (4Q460 5 6) still remains officially unpublished.

Via 25 Luglio, 11/A/2  
I-00046 Grottaferrata

Joseph SIEVERS

## Novum Testamentum

Martin EBNER, *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief*. Untersuchungen zu Form, Motivik und Funktion der Peristasenkataloge bei Paulus (Forschung zur Bibel 66). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1991. xvi-414 p. 23,5 × 15,5. öS 436,80 - DM 56,—

Seven passages in four letters of Paul — Rom 8,31-39; 1 Cor 4,8-16; 2 Cor 4,7-12; 6,4-10; 11,23-29; 12,10; and Phil 4,10-20 — contain *Leidenslisten*, or lists of sufferings, the subject of Martin Ebner's 1991 dissertation, which was directed by Prof. Hans-Josef Klauck and accepted by the Catholic Theological Faculty at the University of Würzburg.

The modern study of these Pauline lists began early this century with R. Bultmann's *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen 1910). He not only assigned them the now familiar term *Peristasenkataloge*, but also emphasized their affinity to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe and their importance for portraying the wise man. In the years since Bultmann's study, investigation of these lists has been sporadic and usually focused on one or only a few of the passages, so that as recently as 1972 H.-D. Betz could still say that a thorough study of the peristasis catalogues — their form, function, and origin — had not yet been done (*Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition* [Tübingen 1972] 98).

This situation is changing. Recently J. T. Fitzgerald published his 1984 Yale dissertation, directed by A. J. Malherbe, under the title *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Investigation of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Atlanta 1988); see my review in *JBL* 108 (1989) 745-748. This study has a comprehensive *Forschungsbericht* and a lexical analysis of the term *περίστασις* (*Cracks*, 7-31 and 33-46). As the title indicates, however, Fitzgerald restricts himself to the Corinthian letters and then only to three of the five catalogues in these letters (leaving out 2 Cor 11,23-29 and 12,10, which he promises to treat in a future study [*Cracks*, 3, n. 7]). As fine a study as it is, it nevertheless remains an ἀρραβών on the thorough study called for by Betz.

Now, however, that thorough study is available. Ebner's study, *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief*, is comprehensive, providing an analysis of all seven passages. And what is more, his analysis is sophisticated, wide-ranging, and incisive. After a brief introduction (1-19), Ebner analyzes each passage in a sequence that reflects the letters' historical order as well as, for 2 Corinthians, its partition: 1 Cor 4,8-16 (20-92); 2 Cor 11,23-29 (93-172); 2 Cor 12,10 (173-195); 2 Cor 4,7-12 (196-242); 2 Cor 6,4-10 (243-330); Phil 4,10-20 (331-364); and Rom 8,31-39 (365-386). A detailed summary concludes the study (387-397).

One merit of such a comprehensive approach is that Ebner is able to provide a nuanced formal analysis, distinguishing various sub-types of peristasis catalogues used by Paul. Thus Ebner categorizes some lists as highly individualized peristasis catalogues (2 Cor 11, 23-29), others as more general catalogues (Rom 8,35b; 2 Cor 6,4-5; 12,10), others as reflecting adiphora catalogues (Phil 4,11-12), and still others as enumerating catalogues of the external circumstances of life (1 Cor 4,11-12). All the lists are biographical, referring specifically to Paul, except for Rom 8,35, which is illustrative of the *περιστάσεις* that all Christians may encounter (see esp. 391).

Beyond these formal classifications of the lists, however, the results of Ebner's individual analyses are so rich and varied that they defy summary. For example, like Bultmann and Fitzgerald, Ebner emphasizes the importance of the diatribe's use of the peristasis catalogue to depict the sage as the principal literary texts against which to view Paul's lists (27-31, 40-52, 69-73 *et passim*), but Ebner also brings many other texts — literary and documentary, Greco-Roman and Jewish — to bear in his analyses (see esp. 14-16). Accordingly, a sampling — one list from each of the four letters — will have to suffice to show the richness of his comparative materials, not to mention the myriad contributions on specific lexical, grammatical, rhetorical, philosophical, and historical matters that occur in these lists.

Paul's earliest list appears in 1 Cor 4,11-13, where he enumerates the conditions of his life as an apostle. Ebner notes that this list is set off by two similar expressions meaning "up to now" (vv. 11.13); that the list itself is made up of verbs — *πεινώμεν καὶ διψῶμεν καὶ γυμνιτεύομεν... καὶ ἄστατοῦμεν κτλ*; and that the verb *κοπιῶμεν* (v.12) receives emphasis by means of the expansion *ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσίν* (21-25).

Ebner's analysis makes much use of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe and other Cynic sources. Paul's list is comparable, he argues, to those in the diatribe, where hunger, thirst, and being without a permanent home are not only regular items but a standard way of depicting the frugal lifestyle of the Cynic (Epictetus, 3.22.47; Dio, *Or.* 8.15-16; Diogenes Laertius, 6.38) (27-31). This literature also allows Ebner to explain the precise meaning of γυμνιτεύειν (v.11). He shows that Cynics, modeling themselves after Socrates, Spartans and Herakles, wore only one garment, the τρίβων, which they threw over one shoulder (Epictetus, 1.24.7; ps.-Crates, *ep.* 23; Lucian, *Bis acc.* 6). Without any undergarment they would thus be partially naked, and this "uniform" thus became another symbol of the frugal Cynic (Epictetus, 3.22.45) (40-50). Paul's use of γυμνιτεύειν, Ebner claims, should thus be understood, not as his going about naked or even as being poorly clothed, but as his dressing similarly to Cynics, i.e., his deliberate waiving of the comfortable undergarment and his having only a rough cloak next to his skin (53).

Paul's list, in other words, presents him as adopting the frugal lifestyle of the Cynic, a self-presentation that, in its immediate literary context, contrasts sharply with the Corinthians who are ironically said be sated, wealthy, and ruling, or wise, strong, and respected (vv.8.10). The contrast in lifestyles and the irony show that Paul's apostleship was contested in Corinth, contested particularly by the Apollos party (cf. 1.12) whose socially elite members found Paul's frugal lifestyle an affront (54-55, 63-68). Paul had to defend himself against this judgment (cf. 4,7), maintain his own moral authority as father (v.14-15), and restore the unity of the community. On the last point Ebner perceptively incorporates Paul's manual labor as a tentmaker (v.12), which not only preserved his financial independence, again on the model of certain Cynics (cf. 69-75), but also — by its very emphasis in the list (v.12) — distanced him from his hosts Aquila, Priscilla, Titius Justus, and Gaius and their households, who presumably belonged to Paul's party (cf. 1.12). Paul's tentmaking thus gave social independence from his hosts and so allowed him to take a position above party strife (75-77).

Four peristasis catalogues appear in 2 Corinthians, or the constituent parts into which it is often partitioned. Of the four, the longest, and one omitted in Fitzgerald's study, is 11,23-29. The situation into which this list must be placed, Ebner says, is different from that for 1 Cor 4,11-13. The Apollos people are no longer Paul's opponents, but some unnamed rival missionaries, whose boasting has made inroads among the Corinthians. Paul had regarded Apollos as an apostle; the rival missionaries he does not. Consequently, it is not party strife that Paul must heal, but his very leadership role in Corinth that is at stake. To reassert that leadership he writes, within 2 Cor 10-13, a *Narrenrede* (11,16-12,11), which includes the lengthy list of 11,23-29 (93-97).

Here Ebner again makes use of Cynic-Stoic materials, but more central to his analysis are rhetorical texts. Specifically, Paul writes a *Redeagon*, his part of a verbal contest between himself and his opponents, with the third party, in this case the Corinthians, acting as judges. He must convince the

Corinthian judges that his understanding of what it means to be a διάκονος Χριστοῦ (cf. 11,23) is better than his opponents' very different one. The attempt involves σύγκρισις, or comparison, another standard rhetorical form, which permits Paul to demonstrate his superiority (97-105).

An important part of this comparison is the list in 11,23-29, which Ebner divides into five strophs: a) v. 23, which enumerates his conflicts with political power, such as imprisonments; b) vv.24-25, which list various punishments, usually with numerical precision — five Jewish beatings, three Roman whippings, one stoning, three shipwrecks, and one night and day in the sea; c) v. 26, which cites various dangers while travelling; d) v. 27, which illustrates his frugal lifestyle, familiar from 1 Cor 4,11-13, though with the added note of sleeplessness; and e) vv.28-29, which mention his daily ecclesiastical περιστάσεις (133-148).

Throughout this analysis Ebner draws many formal parallels, especially from inscriptions involving Augustus and rhetorical speeches about Alexander by Plutarch and Arrian. These texts, Ebner notes, contain peristasis catalogues that are strophic in structure, cite precise numbers, and use anaphora. On the last Ebner notes that Paul's repetition of ἐν c. dat. (vv. 23.26-27) also appears in Plutarch (*Alex. fort. virt.* 341E-F) (112-117). More incisive, however, are various discussions of details. For example, Paul's mention of punishments and shipwreck are striking in the context of a *Redeagon*, so that Ebner suspects a parodic function to Paul's list, a suspicion supported by the incident immediately following in Damascus (vv. 32-33) (130-133). Ebner explains Paul's mention of ἀγρυπνία (v. 27), or sleeplessness, as referring to a deliberate rejection of sleep, a regimen advocated by philosophers not only as a means of self-discipline but also as a quality expected of a leader — precisely the point at issue with Paul's opponents (142-144).

Peristasis catalogues also appear in Philippians and Romans. In the former Paul's list occurs in the so-called *Dankbrief* (4,10-20) (331-332). The list itself (vv. 11-13) is closest in content, Ebner says, to that in 1 Cor 4,11-13, especially if ταπεινοῦσθαι (v. 12) refers, as Ebner thinks, to Paul's working as a tentmaker, which was emphasized in the Corinthian list (337). In any case, the list in Philippians is a special form of peristasis catalogue, an adiaphora catalogue, or one in which both positive and negative circumstances are listed — e.g., χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν (v. 12) (338). Ebner sees the whole catalogue as controlled by the word αὐτάρκης (v. 11), a clearly philosophical term, though Ebner sees Paul as closer to Stoic and Epicurean than to Cynic notions of αὐτάρκεια (338-345). This independence, however, is set within the context of the *Dankbrief* in which Paul expresses his gratitude for the aid which the Philippians had sent through Epaphroditus (vv. 10.15-18). This gratitude is expressed in the language of both friendship (e.g., κοινωνεῖν in v. 15) and business (e.g., λόγος δόσεως καὶ λήψεως and ἀπέχειν in vv. 15.18), a pairing that is characteristic of popular notions of friendship (345-360). Thus the tone and language of friendship — not the irony and parody that are found in the Corinthians letters — sets this catalogue apart.

Finally, in Romans, specifically in 8,31-39, Paul again uses a peristasis catalogue (v. 35), a list of seven περιστάσεις, all of them found earlier in 2 Corinthians except for μάχαιρα, which suggests the ultimate περίστασις, death (371-372). Other individual features: the use of the disjunctive ἢ; the singular form of the various nouns in the list; and the application of these περιστάσεις to all Christians, not just to Paul (372-373). Ebner finds similar non-biographical lists, even with nouns and the disjunctive ἢ, in the diatribe (see, e.g., Epictetus, 2.1.10) (373-374). He also perceptively relates the notion of victory (v. 37: ὑπερνικῶμεν) over these περιστάσεις to the diatribe, where victory language is taken from the gymnasium (Epictetus, 1.18.22) (376-377). The meaning of these περιστάσεις, however, comes from the immediately following quotation from Ps 43,23 LXX (v. 36) which Paul gives a Christological, or Christian, cast, so that all Christians, in their own περιστάσεις, carry around the death of Jesus in their own bodies and yet can be confident of victory over them through their future resurrection (377).

This hasty and partial summary of Ebner's study of the peristasis catalogues in Paul's letters will, I hope, suggest the wide-ranging erudition and incisive analysis that characterize virtually every page. The overall impression of this comprehensive study is to document how supple the peristasis catalogue was in form and function, capable of various means of expression and suited to a wide range of situations. Ebner, like Fitzgerald, still traces the origin of Paul's use of this form to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, and the parallels from these sources are numerous and exact, but Ebner has also moved beyond this narrowly philosophical context and incorporated other, equally relevant sources, especially rhetorical works and handbooks.

And yet, despite such a wide casting of the parallel net, Ebner still stays pretty much within a history of ideas framework. Even though peristasis catalogues are lists of experiences, these lists are discussed at a rather abstract level. For example, the daily experiences of Paul's apostolic life that are listed in 1 Cor 4,11-13 are abstracted into a Cynic lifestyle, and the horrific experiences listed in 2 Cor 11,23-29 are merely classified according to their arena: politics, travel, daily life, and church. The lists call for a more descriptive or social analysis. What did Paul look like after all these experiences? What did his original aristocratic status mean for someone who faced such varied and frequent sufferings and humiliations? How many other people had similar experiences?

These questions are meant only to suggest further directions for analyzing the peristasis catalogue. Ebner's *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief* stands as a stunning achievement and one that deserves translation in order to reach larger audiences. For the book is not so focused as the title suggests; the focus on the peristasis catalogue is merely Ebner's vantage point for giving us a most rewarding and illuminating view of Paul's life, letters, and theology in their Greco-Roman context.

Bruce W. LONGENECKER, *Eschatology and the Covenant. A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11* (JSNT Supplement Series 57). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 318 p. 22 × 14. £35.00 - \$60.00

Les commentateurs de l'épître aux Romains ont souvent rapproché, ponctuellement, divers passages de 4 Esdras de certains versets de l'épître. Ainsi, dans ses *Études sur l'épître aux Romains* (recueil posthume), S. Lyonnet ne citait pas moins de quatorze fois l'apocalypse d'Esdras. Toutefois, le rapprochement le plus fréquent est celui établi entre Rm 5 et les passages de 4 Esdras traitant du péché d'Adam et de ses conséquences pour l'humanité (cf. par exemple Lagrange, Bonsirven). Le projet de B. W. Longenecker est différent. Il se propose de confronter les deux écrits du point de vue de l'Alliance, plus précisément «the question of how each author interacts with ethnocentric covenantalism on matters of the Law and the people of God» (36). Pour réaliser son projet l'auteur analyse séparément d'abord 4 Esdras (40-155), puis Rm 1–11 (166-265). Enfin le dernier chapitre, assez bref, confronte les deux écrits.

A première vue, le projet de l'auteur risque de paraître quelque peu artificiel, tant les deux écrits apparaissent distants. Comme le relevait S. Lyonnet: «L'horizon du Pseudo-Esdras se limite exclusivement au destin d'Israël» alors que «la pensée de Paul, elle, est essentiellement universaliste» (*Études*, 13). Pourtant, la démarche de l'auteur se révèle non seulement originale, mais encore éclairante et stimulante.

Le point de départ est donc ce que l'auteur, à la suite de E. P. Sanders, nomme «ethnocentric covenantalism». Le passage suivant des *Antiquités Bibliques* exprime bien le sens de l'expression: «Voici maintenant que le Seigneur aura pitié de vous aujourd'hui, non pas à cause de vous, mais à cause de son alliance qu'il a établie en faveur de vos pères et en considération du serment qu'il a juré de ne pas vous délaisser jusqu'à la fin» (XXX,7). Telle était bien la foi traditionnelle d'Israël (cf. Lv 26). Elle reposait sur ces deux piliers: le don de la loi – l'élection du peuple. Cette foi avait été aussi celle de l'auteur de 4 Esdras. Dans les chapitres 3–8, il l'explique parfois même magnifiquement. Annie Jaubert n'hésitait pas à prétendre que 4 Esd 5,23-29 était sans doute le plus beau poème sur l'élection d'Israël. Pourtant, chaque fois qu'«Esdras» fait appel aux promesses divines, à la miséricorde de Dieu pour son peuple, l'ange Uriel — porte-parole de Dieu — le contredit, le récuse. Selon Uriel, seul un petit, très petit «Reste», qui aura été fidèle à la loi, sera sauvé. Autrement dit, le peuple, comme tel, n'est plus élu et Dieu n'intervient plus dans l'histoire en sa faveur. Comme le dit l'auteur, Dieu est devenu le grand absent de l'histoire!

Or, à partir du chapitre 9, «Esdras» qui défendait si bien l'«ethnocentric covenantalism» se rallie à la nouvelle compréhension des rapports de Dieu avec Israël, telle que la présentait Uriel. Désormais, pour «Esdras», le «Juif» ne doit plus compter que sur ses mérites, qu'il gagne en obéissant à la loi. Au peuple se substitue donc l'individu!

Selon l'heureuse formule de B.W.L.: 4 Esdras est à la fois l'histoire d'une conversion et le témoin d'une situation de crise... Dérouté par la ruine



de Jérusalem, la destruction du Temple (en 70), le silence de Dieu, «Esdras» ne croit plus à un salut du peuple dans le monde à venir. Cet écrit est né du désespoir. La nouvelle «foi» d'«Esdras», celle que lui a apprise Uriel, est assurément «nouvelle». Toutefois, peut-être l'est-elle moins que ne le laisse entendre B.W.L. En effet, comme l'avaient relevé K. Koch, *ZAW* 67 (1955) 205-226 et F. Dreyfus, *DBS* X, 432-436 — non mentionnés par l'auteur —, dans les écrits postexiliques, l'emploi du verbe *bāḥar* («élire») n'est plus appliqué à Israël en son entier mais seulement à certains de ses membres. «Esdras» s'inscrirait donc dans un courant de pensée antérieur, même s'il l'intensifie et le radicalise.

Qu'en est-il de Paul dans les chapitres 1-8 de l'épître aux Romains? Par certains côtés, il s'avère proche d'«Esdras», pas seulement par son pessimisme, mais d'abord par l'abandon de l'«ethnocentric covenantalism». Pour lui aussi, Israël ne saurait revendiquer le moindre privilège. Du fait de l'impartialité divine, Juifs et païens se trouvent sur le même plan.

Dans les chapitres 1-3, Paul sape systématiquement toutes les prétentions d'Israël, il nivelle les situations des uns et des autres. A cet égard, il est donc proche d'«Esdras». Toutefois, alors que pour celui-ci, en dépit de la présence en tout homme du «cœur mauvais», le règne du péché n'est pas total, certains parvenant au salut par leurs mérites. Pour Paul, ce règne est universel, sans exception. De ce fait également, il n'y plus aucune différence entre le Juif et le païen (10,12). Aussi Juifs et païens ne peuvent-ils plus compter que sur la grâce de Dieu manifestée dans la croix du Christ (3,24). L'analyse proposée par l'auteur nous paraît pertinente. Il nous semble cependant regrettable qu'il n'ait pas eu connaissance du remarquable article de J. N. Aletti, «Rm 1,8-3,20. Incohérence ou cohérence de l'argumentation paulinienne?», *Bib* 69 (1988) 47-62, qui lui aurait permis d'approfondir son analyse. Si Paul et «Esdras» s'accordent pour discréditer la confiance d'Israël en son élection, ils se séparent toutefois en ce qui concerne la Loi. Pour «Esdras», celle-ci est toujours voie de salut, même si ceux qui lui sont fidèles ne constituent qu'un «Reste». Pour Paul, la Loi est soit malédiction, soit totalement impuissante du fait du péché. (Signalons ici les pages intéressantes consacrées à Rm 7, p. 225-245. Elles seront sans doute discutées). Aussi, le salut ne peut-il se trouver que dans la communauté de l'Esprit.

Les chapitres 9-11 ouvrent subitement des perspectives nouvelles. Paul, contrairement à ce qu'il avait déclaré dans les chapitres antérieurs, fait soudainement appel à l'«ethnocentric covenantalism». Le mot «alliance», jusqu'alors absent, apparaît dès 9,4. La situation des Juifs n'est plus identique à celle des païens. En effet, ils sont «aimés à cause des Pères» (11,28). Comment expliquer un tel revirement? Il est surprenant que l'auteur ne se soit pas interrogé, comme C. H. Dodd, qu'il mentionne pourtant dans sa bibliographie, sur l'unité de l'épître aux Romains. Les chapitres 9-11 n'auraient-ils pas été joints, après coup, aux chapitres 1-8? La question se pose inévitablement, d'autant plus que, comme nous croyons pouvoir le montrer dans un article à paraître prochainement, il n'y a pas de continuité entre le chapitre 8 et les chapitres 9-11.

L'analyse faite par l'auteur de ces chapitres 9-11 est classique et n'apporte rien de nouveau. Relevons cependant son interprétation de Lv 18,5 en

Rm 10,5 (222-224) qui doit beaucoup à J.D.G. Dunn. L'auteur nous semble avoir été sur le point d'adopter l'interprétation que nous avons proposée en 1984 (*RB* 91 [1984] 321-350) et qu'il ignore d'ailleurs. Malheureusement, selon nous, il n'a pas osé tirer les conclusions qui paraissaient découler de son analyse. Une dernière remarque: il nous semble étonnant que l'auteur ne s'interroge pas sur la signification de l'olivier franc en 11,16-24. Celui-ci désignerait-il l'Israël « historique » ou bien la *Heilsgemeinde*, la communauté spirituelle de ceux qui sont appelés (cf. *RB* 98 [1991] 70-76)? La décision n'est pas indifférente. Elle commande l'interprétation de 11,25-27 et 11,32.

Quoi qu'il en soit de nos divergences avec l'auteur concernant les chapitres 9-11, si obscurs il est vrai, il reste que Paul, en ces chapitres, se réfère à l'« ethnocentric covenantalism » qu'il avait rejeté dans les chapitres 1-8. Pour autant, Paul n'abandonne pas sa perspective universaliste. Le refus dramatique des Juifs est expliqué comme contribuant au salut des païens. Il reste que la démarche de Paul dans ces chapitres demeure une énigme. Elle semble prendre le contre-pied de celle d'« Esdras ». Celui-ci défendait l'« ethnocentric covenantalism » dans les chapitres 3-8 pour l'abandonner dans les chapitres suivants. Dans l'épître aux Romains, du moins telle qu'elle nous est parvenue, Paul fait apparemment le chemin inverse. Dans quel but? Il est difficile de répondre à cette question. L'auteur, du reste, n'a pas cherché à résoudre ce problème.

Rue du Faubourg Saint-Honoré, 22  
F-75008 Paris

François REFOULÉ OP

## Varia

G. I. DAVIES assisted by M. N. A. BOCKMUEHL, D. R. DE LACEY and A. J. POULTER, *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions, Corpus and Concordance*. Cambridge, University Press, 1991. xxxiv-563 p. 23,5 × 15,5. £75.00 - \$110.00

Das Epigraphische Material des Vorderen Orients ist eine der wichtigsten Quellen nicht nur für die Geschichte der semitischen Sprachen, sondern ebenso sehr für unsere Kenntnis der Religion, Geschichte und überhaupt der kulturellen Verhältnisse dieses für die Bibelwissenschaft so interessanten Teils unserer Welt. Eine der bisher wichtigsten Quellenausgaben dieses Materials war der alles andere als vollständige Band *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften* von H. Donner und W. Röllig (Wiesbaden 1964-66). Der Schwerpunkt dieser Arbeit lag auf den Übersetzungen und Kommentaren sowie auf den unentbehrlichen Abbildungen der Inschriften in Originalschrift, die immer noch Donner-Rölligs Arbeit zu einer der wichtigsten unserer Quellen für die nordwestsemitische Epigraphie machen. Der Umfang des Materials bei Donner-Röllig ist aber leider recht knapp. Von den Lachish- und Samaria-Ostraka finden wir nur eine sehr kleine Auswahl. Dazu kommt, daß während der letzten Jahre viel neues Material gefunden wurde.

Eine andere Ausgabe, die vollständiger aber heute ganz veraltet ist, war D. Diringers Arbeit, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (Firenze 1934) mit ihrer weiteren Fortsetzung in S. Moscatis *L'Epigrafia Ebraica Antica: 1935-1950* (Biblica et Orientalia 15; Roma 1951). Besonders die zahlreichen israelischen Ausgrabungen des letzten halben Jahrhunderts haben das Material in einem fast ganz unüberblickbaren Maß vermehrt, und der Forscher, der sich mit der nordwestsemitischen Epigraphie beschäftigt, hatte bis heute nicht viele andere Möglichkeiten, als eine große Zahl von nicht immer ganz leicht zugänglichen Zeitschriften und anderen Publikationen durchzugehen.

Darum ist die Arbeit von G.I. Davies und seinen Mitarbeitern sehr willkommen. Die Arbeit besteht aus zwei im Umfang etwa gleichmäßigen Abteilungen, von denen die erste ein vollständiges Corpus aller hebräischen Inschriften sowie Siegel, Siegelabdrücke und Murabba'at Papyri der Zeit 1000-200 v. Chr. darstellt; die andere Abteilung besteht aus einer Konkordanz sämtlicher vorkommenden Wörter sowie Zifferbezeichnungen und anderen vorkommenden nicht alphabetischen Zeichen des Materials. Für die Zukunft ist auch eine grammatische Konkordanz geplant. Die Intention war, nur das hebräische Material in das Buch aufzunehmen, aber wie die Herausgeber bemerken, ist es oft sehr schwierig, die Sprache einer kurzen Inschrift oder eines Siegels zu bestimmen. Einige früher für hebräisch gehaltene Siegel, die jedoch von neueren Forschern als nicht-hebräisch angesehen werden, sind daher ausgeschlossen. Andererseits sind die aramäischen sogenannten *Jehud*-Stempel mitberücksichtigt. Das Buch stützt sich auf eine computerisierte Datenbank, die man dem Herausgeber zufolge fortlaufen aktualisieren wird, wenn in der Zukunft neues Material publiziert wird.

Die Arbeit beginnt mit einer Transliterationstabelle der althebräischen Schrift, auf die ein Verzeichnis der verschiedenen numerischen und nicht-numerischen Symbolzeichen, die in den Inschriften vorkommen, sowie eine Karte der verschiedenen Fundorte, folgen. Der Hauptteil dieser ersten Hälfte des Buches besteht aus den Inschriften in lateinischer Transliteration ohne Übersetzung. Hier kann man sich im Ernst fragen, ob es nicht mit aller, in dem Vorwort erwähnten, bei der Fertigstellung der Arbeit benutzten modernen Hochtechnologie auch möglich gewesen wäre, den Text in hebräischer Quadratschrift wiederzugeben. Eine Darstellung in hebräischer Schrift hätte unter allen Umständen den Gebrauch des Buches erheblich erleichtert und wäre in einer Arbeit dieser Preisklasse zu erwarten. Ich glaube daß die Mehrzahl der Benutzer des Buches mit mir einig ist, daß ein unvokalisierte hebräischer Text in lateinischer Umschrift nicht sehr leicht überblickbar ist.

In der Darstellung der Texte sind unsichere Zeichen sowie Lacunae, Korrekturen und alternative Lesungen angegeben. Ein Vergleich mit Donner-Rölligs Arbeit zeigt uns, daß die Zahl der unsicheren Zeichen etwa dieselbe ist, andererseits haben Davies und seine Mitarbeiter oft eine andere Auffassung als Donner-Röllig, welche Zeichen für unsicher zu halten sind. Da die Absicht der Arbeit war, den von der Mehrheit der Forscher unterstützten Lesungen zu folgen, sind neue Lesungen fast niemals berücksichtigt. Aus demselben Grund werden auch nicht viele Variantlesungen präsentiert.

Soweit möglich, ist auch jede Inschrift mit einer Datierung versehen die oft nur das Jahrhundert angibt. Die bibliographischen Angaben sind auf das notwendige Minimum konzentriert und führen sehr häufig nur eine oder zwei Arbeiten an, aber wohlgeordnet nicht immer die Erstveröffentlichungen der einzelnen Texte. Diese Angaben werden aber am Ende des Buches durch eine Vergleichstabelle der Numerierung der Texte in den wichtigsten Sammelausgaben ergänzt.

Diese Sammelausgaben sind: D. Diringer, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (Firenze 1934); K. Galling, "Beschriftete Bildsiegel des ersten Jahrtausends v. Chr. vornehmlich aus Syrien und Palästina", *ZDPV* 64 (1941) 112-202; J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Volume 1: Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions* (Oxford 1960); R. Hestrin - M. Dayagi-Mendels, *Inscribed Seals. First Temple Period* (Jerusalem 1979); L. G. Herr, *The Script of Ancient North-West Semitic Seals* (Missoula, Montana 1978); R. Hestrin - Y. Israeli - Y. Meshorer - A. Eitan (eds.), *Inscriptions Revealed* (Jerusalem 1973); H. Donner - W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften. Vol. 1* (Wiesbaden 1962); A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I: Les Ostraca* (Paris 1977); S. Moscati, *L'epigrafia ebraica antica: 1935-1950* (Biblica et Orientalia 15; Roma 1951); D. Pardee et al., *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters* (SBL Sources for Biblical Study No 15; Chico, CA 1982); R. W. Suder, *Hebrew Inscriptions. A Classified Bibliography* (Selinsgrove 1984); F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici I-III". I: *Bib* 50 (1969) 357-388; II: *Augustinianum* 11 (1971) 447-454; III: *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 38 (1978) 227-254.

Das System, nach dem das Material geordnet ist, geht von den Fundorten und der Art des Materials aus. Bei den eigentlichen Inschriften bezeichnet die erste Ziffer den Fundort, dann folgt ein Punkt und eine fortlaufende Nummer, oft im Anschluß an die Numerierung der Erstpublikationen. Oft gibt es auch leere Nummern für zukünftige Ergänzungen. Die Fundorte fangen mit (1) Lachish an, wonach (2) Arad folgt, auch hier mit Datierungen nach dem Jahrhundert; die Strata sind nicht angegeben. Die Nummern 2.001 bis 2.104 und 2.110 bis 2.112 entsprechen folglich den Nummern 1-104; 110-112 in Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem 1981), aber wo sind die Siegel No 105-109? Die Antwort ist, daß alle Siegel und Siegelabdrücke unter den Nummer 100.001 bis 100.900 zusammengeführt sind. Nach den Herausgebern wurden auch hier die Numerierungen im Anschluß an die üblichen Sammelausgaben vorgenommen, aber trotzdem ist es nicht allzu leicht, sich hier zu orientieren.

Die Numerierung folgt den folgenden Publikationen: Davies 100.001 - 100.438 entsprechen denselben Nummern in Vattioni I-III; Davies 100.453 - 100.468 entsprechen Diringer 119.1 - 144.29; Davies 100.469 - 100.483 entsprechen Moscati 75.10 - 63.37; Davies 100.501 - 100.711 entsprechen N. Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah, Remnants from a Burnt Archive* (Jerusalem 1986) No. 1-211; Davies 100.801 - 100.851 entsprechen Y. Shilo, "A Group of Hebrew Bullae from the City of David", *IEJ* 36 (1986) No. 1-51; Davies 100.883 - 100.898 entsprechen N. Avigad, "The Seals of Women and Other Hebrew Seals", *EI* 20 (1989) No. 1-16.

Was man hier vermißt, ist ein Register der Fundorte der verschiedenen Siegel. Wenn wir nun die fünf Arad-Siegel finden möchten, gibt es, vorausgesetzt daß wir den Text kennen, nur die Möglichkeit, über die Konkordanz zu gehen; so können wir finden, daß die Arad-Siegel No. 105-109, bei Davies den Nummern 100.282, 100.231, 100.232, 100.230 und 100.212, in der angegebenen Reihenfolge entsprechen. Zudem werden Arad No. 105 bis 108 als *Arad Inscriptions* 5-8 bezeichnet. Wir fragen uns warum?

Nach (2), Arad, folgen (3), Samaria Ostraka No. 3.001-110, und Samaria Elfenbeininschriften No. 3.206-226. Die Nummern 3.301-312 sind hauptsächlich den Samaria-Sebaste Scherben (Crowfoot, *Samaria-Sebaste* 3 [1957]) gewidmet. Die Samaria Ostraka werden sämtlich mit den meisten Forschern auf das 8. Jahrhundert datiert. Daß es auch gute Gründe gibt, mit B. Mazar die Ostraka auf das Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts zu datieren, wird von G.I. Davies nicht erwähnt (B. Maisler [heute Mazar], "The Historical Background of the Samaria Ostraca", *JPOS* 21 [1948] 117-133).

Die Inschriften aus Jerusalem haben die Nummern 4.101-404, unter denen die Nummern 4.301-302, die zwei Israel Museum Silberrollen vertreten. Hier haben wir folglich die erste leicht zugängliche Veröffentlichung dieser zwei ganz einzigartigen Funde. Bei der Nummer 4.401 (*Silwan Royal Steward Inscription*) können wir feststellen, daß die bei KAI angegeben kurze Inschrift A, צדק בן פתח, ganz und gar fehlt. Die Literaturangabe bezieht sich hier auf N. Avigad, "The Epitaph of a Royal Steward from Siloam Village" *IEJ* 3 (1953) 137-152, aber die Erstveröffentlichung von Ch. Clermont-Ganneau in *Archaeological Researches in Palestine I* [1899] 305-306, ist nicht erwähnt.

Aus dem folgenden Verzeichnis der Fundorte möchte ich besonders einige hervorheben, und zwar No. 8, Kuntilet Ajrud, mit 23 Inschriften, No. 9, Kadesh Barnea, mit zehn Inschriften, wonach No. 10, Gezer, mit dem Gezerkalender als No. 10.001 sowie zwei sehr kurze Grafitti-Inschriften aus Gezer folgen. Unter No. 22, Gibeon, sind die 62 inskribierten Krughenkel angeführt, und No. 23.003 präsentiert die für unser Verständnis der altisraelitischen Religion so wichtige Khirbet el-Qom Inschrift.

Die Liste umfaßt, wie wir einleitend erwähnten, nicht nur eigentliche Inschriften, sondern auch anderes Material wie die zwei unter Nummer 33.001-002 angeführten Wadi Muraba'at Papyri aus dem 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Die Liste der Inschriften verschiedener Fundorte endet mit 99.001, dem kleinen Granatapfel unbekannter Herkunft (Siehe A. Lemaire, "Une Inscription Paléo-Hébraïque sur Grenade en Ivoire", *RB* 88 [1981] 236-239), wonach, wie wir früher erwähnten, unter No. 100 die Siegel und Siegelabdrücke folgen. Den Abschluß bilden (105) Königliche Stempel, (106) Juda und Jerusalem Stempel und Münzen, (107) Andere offizielle Stempel, (108) Inskribierte Gewichte und (109) Inskribierte Maße. Von den letztgenannten werden zwei Exemplare, beide aus Susa, von den Herausgebern angeführt.

Wenn wir zum zweiten Teil des Buches, zur Konkordanz, kommen, stellen wir fest, daß diese rein alphabetisch, ohne Rücksicht auf die Wurzeln aufgebaut ist. In der sehr vollständigen Konkordanz, die auch Präpositio-

nen und Partikel umfaßt, sind auch viele Wörter mit fraglichen oder ergänzten Buchstaben aufgenommen; sie muß folglich mit einer gewissen Vorsicht gebraucht werden.

Wie schon im Vorwort des Buches erwähnt wurde, war die Herstellung einer Konkordanz der Hauptzweck dieses Buches, und als solche ist es auch eine Leistung, die unsere zukünftige Arbeit an der Epigraphie des alten Israels in vieler Hinsicht erleichtert. Wir haben hier eine moderne Referenzarbeit, die das gesamte epigraphische Material umfaßt. Vieles Material, das früher leicht übergangen wurde, wird hier leicht zugänglich vorgelegt. Von der Konkordanz aus kann der Benutzer direkt zum Corpus des Buches gehen, von wo der Weg zu den ausführlicheren Publikationen, die immer noch unentbehrlich sind, leicht zu finden ist. Dazu haben wir in G. I. Davies Arbeit ein allumfassendes Nomenklatursystem, das auch für die Zukunft offen ist.

Alles in allem vermittelt uns die Arbeit den Eindruck einer sehr sorgfältigen Leistung. Den Herausgebern ist nur zu gratulieren, und wir wünschen ihnen auch den besten Erfolg bei der Verwirklichung der im Vorwort erwähnten fortlaufend aktuellen Datenbank der hebräischen Epigraphie.

Nöbbelevs Kyrkoväg, 105  
S-226 53 Lund  
Sweden

Stig NORIN

Steven E. FASSBERG, *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah* (Harvard Semitic Studies 38). Scholars Press, Atlanta, GA, 1990. 322 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Cloth: \$39.95 (\$24.95)

Ever since P. Kahle published in 1930 his *Masoreten des Westens*, II with a number of nearly fully or partly pointed fragments of a Palestinian Pentateuch Targum originating in the Cairo Genizah, scholars have been aware of the importance of these texts. Their importance has in no way diminished with the subsequent discovery of a complete Palestinian Targum, Codex Neofiti. Since 1930 further fragments belonging to the same tradition have been discovered by scholars such as A. Díez Macho and M. Klein, the latter of whom has produced an excellent corpus, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati 1986), to which some new material published, also by Klein, in *Sefarad* 49 (1989) 123-133 should be added.

Specialists in Aramaic linguistics have been conscious of the significance of this corpus. One is reminded of a preliminary study by H. L. Ginsberg in *Tarbiz* 5 (1934). Some scholars such as E. Y. Kutscher, A. Tal, M. Sokoloff (in his *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* [Ramat-Gan 1990] and the present reviewer, dealing with specific issues in Aramaic grammar, have made extensive use of the relevant data contained in these fragments. All these

scattered notes and observations, however, are not comparable to a comprehensive treatment as represented now by Fassberg's monograph.

The work under review was initially undertaken as a Harvard Ph.D. dissertation, submitted in 1983. A comparison with the dissertation, however, reveals that the present monograph has been vastly expanded and revised, making full use of the above-mentioned edition by Klein.

The author has set himself two objectives: to describe a grammar of the Aramaic of the Cairo Genizah fragments, and to compare it with Aramaic of other Targumim and other Aramaic dialects such as Biblical Aramaic, Galilaean Aramaic, Samaritan Aramaic, Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, Christian Palestinian Aramaic (Palestinian Syriac, in F.'s nomenclature), Syriac, Mandaic, and the Ma'lula dialect. Qumran Aramaic is not brought in for systematic comparison, presumably in the absence of a comprehensive treatment of this particular idiom. The grammar described covers orthography, phonology, morphology, and a couple of syntactic features (treated very briefly). Appended are a bibliography, a full and highly useful index of verses, and a full index of words.

The author examined the original manuscripts personally, except those of Leningrad and Cincinnati. Where his reading differs from that of Klein, it is marked with "ˆ", and such disagreements are literally countless. Occasionally F.'s reading agrees with that of Kahle. Whenever a Genizah Aramaic form is cited, it is fully reproduced with Palestinian and/or Tiberian vowel signs and all other extraneous graphic symbols, most of which appear to have been manually added, which must have meant an incredible amount of care and labour. F. is fully abreast of the past and contemporary work on the subject (curiously, the bibliography lists the first edition of Fitzmyer's commentary on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, though F. quotes from the second ed.). We miss W. Fischer's study: "Zur Chronologie morphophonematischer Gesetzmässigkeiten im Aramäischen" (FS. H. Wehr; [ed. W. Fischer] Wiesbaden 1969) 175-191. F.'s work is thorough, and the grammar represents very solid scholarship of Semitic philology. He has put all Semitists and Aramaists in deep debt.

Given the great wealth of materials provided, it might sound a bit of chutzpah to ask for more. Although it is no easy task to write a syntax of translated texts, a grammar is not complete without one. Besides, the translation embodied in these fragments is often not too closely bound to the Hebrew original. Secondly, the index of words lists words in their basic, unvocalized form with references to passages in the grammar where they are cited. It is not easy, for instance, if not impossible, to know under what forms, vocalized or otherwise, the verb אָזַל, for example, is attested in the Genizah fragments; one can only turn to §138 *Verbs I-* where one finds, in §138j, a paragraph which is supposed to give representative examples of the imperative of this class of verbs, only אָזַל and אָזְלוּ, but not אָזַל, אָזְלוּ, אָזְלוּ, all of which are listed under §138c with the exclusion of the first two. Finally, F. makes no attempt to draw a general picture of the character of the language of the Genizah fragments and determine its relation to other affiliated and contemporary Aramaic dialects.

Understandably, a great deal of attention is paid to an analysis of the vowel and other graphic symbols added to the consonantal text of these fragments, their phonological interpretation, and their comparison with the standard Tiberian system. F. concludes that the inventory of vocalic phonemes of our idiom consisted of /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/, and /ə/. Whilst he presents a meticulous analysis of the ways whereby each of these phonemes is marked with various vowel signs, we are not told how he has isolated these phonemes in the first place, though he expresses himself uncertain as to, for instance, whether the perfect 2nd m.pl. suffix is /tun/ or /ton/ (§11t), for according to F., both /u/ and /o/ occur in final, closed, and stressed syllables. See also §34a with note 1 there. It is not demonstrated, either, that the so-called shewa mobile constitutes a separate phoneme.

The haphazard use of qamatz and patach on the one hand, and tzere and seghol on the other (and likewise the two pairs of two vowel signs each in the Palestinian vocalized texts) leads F. to conclude that our idiom possessed only one /a/ and /e/ phoneme each. Therefore there would be no phonemic difference between /bar/ "son" and /bar/ "the outside". However, one wonders whether one should not take into account a significant distinction at the morphophonemic level, namely with the addition of the emphatic state suffix, the one becomes /bra/ and the other /bara/. Forms such as CGN 35.9 בְּרִיכָה and אֵינִי־עוֹל contravene the familiar phonological rule whereby the historically short and stressed /a/ and /e/ are deleted with the moving forward of the stress. Likewise, should one not postulate some difference between /malkathon/ "their queen" and /malkathon/ "their queens"? Compare /malkteh/ "his queen", but /malkathon/ "their queen". The indiscriminate use of the vowel signs does not have to mean that the *langue* they are supposed to notate did not necessarily distinguish two vowel phonemes of /a/ and /e/ respectively. For the need or desirability of integrating phonology and morphology, see E.C. Fudge in J. Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics* (Harmondsworth 1970) 89-94, and P.H. Matthews, *Morphology* (Cambridge 1974) 196-215.

§4b. The spirantized and plosive realizations of the phonemes /bgdkpt/ are said to be "conditioned allophones". F., however, does not spell out what the conditions are. Obviously the situation is different between Bibl. Aram. in the Tiberian tradition, Syriac, and our idiom.

§9g. הִיָּתָא // הִיָּתָא are quoted as examples of the vowel /e/ in open syllables, but the same pair are quoted in §9d as examples of the same vowel phoneme in closed syllables. The author's view on syllable structure and the nature of shewa seems not to have firmed up yet.

§11b. A clear-cut minimal pair would be provided by /tur/ "mountain" and /tor/ "Guard!" (impv. of G *ntr*).

§14t The term 'Proto-Aramaic' as used here and often elsewhere in the monograph needs to be clearly defined. In F.'s preferred scheme of relationship between "Proto-Aramaic" and the Genizah Aramaic there is no place for /e/ developed from PA /a/. Though F. considers the prefix of the G infinitive to be /me-/, it is widely believed to originate from /\*ma-/. Another example of this vague "Proto-Aramaic" may be found on p. 322, middle.

§15b. The diphthong is retained also in fem.sg. imperatives of III-y verbs, such as E Gen 30.2 אֲתִי.



§15d. There are more categories where \*ay contracts to /e/ than indicated by F. E.g., the numeral /tren/, and /bet/ "the house of".

§15w. The Syriac "ay and aw are generally preserved in open syllables and contract in originally closed syllables": is something amiss with this statement?

§21. The reality of gemination seems to be indicated by the spelling Gen 38,20 עוֹיָה, though the reading is not quite certain: Klein (vol. 1, p. 95) reads עוֹיָה, but see the letter shape in אֹלָה on line 9.

§25b. As further possible cases of the elided suffix /h/, add D Gen 38,25 עֵינָא "her eyes"; F Exod 19,3 דְּבַרִּי דִּי "the speech of the Lord".

§31. "Stress is penultimate when the final syllable is a vowel, except in the case of vowels which are reflexes of original diphthongs or originally closed syllables; otherwise it is ultimate". This statement, which is said to apply to Bibl. Aram., Targum Onqelos, Syriac and our idiom is somewhat imprecise and vague. For a start, there is a difference in this regard between Eastern and Western Syriac. Where do, for instance, בֵּית, אֶרְצָא, and a host of others fit in?

§34. How does one justify the phonematization of the pronoun אַתְּ as /att/? No other case of a word-final consonant being doubled is known.

§37a. F. gives /ek/ as the 2 f.s. possessive suffix, although it is consistently vocalized with hiriq and, if not vocalized, spelled with Yod. According to his analysis, either /e/ or /i/ can occur in stressed, closed, final syllables.

The suffixation of nouns of the type אב is not dealt with.

§40a-b. The independent possessive pronoun /did-/ occurs in Syriac as well. In our idiom, besides, it is not a simple alternative for the suffixed possessive pronoun. Firstly, its attributive use is confined to unnaturalised, "exotic" loan words: Gen 4,4; 32,22 דוֹרוֹן דִּידִיָּה "his gift"; Gen 43,16, 44.1 פִּלְטִין דִּידִיָּה "his palace". Secondly, it is used predicatively or absolutely, i.e. without a substantival head: Gen 31,48 אֲנִי דִּידִיָּה אֲנִי "all that you see is mine".

§41e. Where a noun is modified by both a demonstrative pronoun and an adjective, the sequence is as in F Lev 23,27 לִירֵחָא שְׁבִיעִיָּה הַדִּין.

§47d. For an attempt to explain the different vocalizations of the numeral for "two", see E. Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (tr. M. Sokoloff) (Ramat-Gan 1976) 48f. F.'s explanation is a definite improvement.

§53a. We miss mention of the m.pl.emph. allomorph /-e/ in nisbeh words.

§54. One misses mention of the feminine ending /-ay/ as in E Gen 41,19 אַחֲרַיָּי. Somewhat surprisingly, מֶלֶה appears as masculine in its only two occurrences (Gen 34,18; Exod 22,8), possibly under the influence of Heb. מֶלֶךְ which it translates. Note that דוֹרוֹן (δῶρον, neuter!), translating מִנְחָה, is feminine in our corpus (Gen 32,19).

§56. As F. treats nouns and adjectives as a single morphological category, let us note one difference, namely the lack of the status constructus in the latter. Note the typical transformation in Gen 39,6 יִפְּה תֹאֵר וַיִּפְּה מֵרֵאָה for MT יָאִי בְרִינְהָ וּשְׁפִיר בַּחוּזָה.

§58. פִּם "mouth" is pronounced with /u/ in Bibl. Aram. as well, which could be the source of influence rather than Targum Onqelos, though in BA the word is always spelled defectively. Incidentally, there is another

example of /pum/ in our corpus, which seems to have escaped F.'s notice: F Exod 20,2 פָּם.

P. 216, n. 49. שֵׁם. "name" with /e/ is not attested in Palestinian Syriac. See M. Bar-Asher, *Palestinian Syriac Studies* (Jerusalem 1977) 460 and Ch. Mueller-Kessler, *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen* (Zürich-New York 1991) 127f.

P. 216, n. 52. בִּרְתָּה as given by G. Dalman (*Grammatik*, 200) should perhaps be interpreted as /bratteh/ (as in Taaj, the Yemenite tradition), and not /brateh/.

§ 64a. Add: /salla/ "basket" as in D Deut 28,17 סָלִי.

§ 123c. The Aramaic of the Babyl. Talmud in the Yemenite tradition has, in addition to /qtálit/, /qtali/ and /qtili/ for the pf. 1sg.: Sh. Morag, *Babylonian Aramaic. The Yemenite Tradition* (Jerusalem 1988) 125.

§ 123f. An important statement of F.'s is regrettably marred by the ambiguous English: "unique to Aramaic dialects", where "amongst" must be meant.

P. 234, n. 10. The ending -נן for the pf. 3f.pl. of III-y/w' verbs in Palestinian Syriac is somewhat suspect. F. apparently relies on Schulthess' grammar (§ 139). See Mueller-Kessler, *Grammatik*, p. 152: "ein eindeutiger Syriasmus" (so Schulthess).

P. 236, n. 40. Here again the picture regarding Pal. Syr. is different according to Mueller-Kessler.

§ 131i. If זכירן in F Exod 20,8 is not an error for זכור (MT זָכַר), then what follows — ית ימא דשובתא — is not its object, but is anticipating יתיה in the following למקדשה יתיה. Two other passive participles mentioned by F. are governed by the preposition Beth, and thus not genuinely transitive.

§ 131s. Examples with the prefix vowel /a-/ when the first radical is a guttural ought to be added: e.g. F Num 28,26 תִּזְבְּדִין.

§ 138d. Add C Gen 35,9 מָסָא as an example of the quiescent Alef.

§ 138e. Of course the ubiquitous causative of אתה must be added, for it shares some important morphological features with Verbs I-'. This highlights the inadequacy of the traditional mode of description of the verb morphology. Thus סלק (treated in § 152b, Irregular verbs) should be mentioned in § 131c as an example of /e,o/ Ablaut class.

§ 139b. No discussion of the dagesh in forms such as Cd Exod 9,29 קָדַע is found.

P. 245, n. 275. The dagesh in a paradigm in Dalman's grammar, p. 406 (חִיתָא) is rather dubious.

§ 156j. The complementary distribution of הך and כות corresponds to that of /'ak/ and /'akwaat/ in Syriac.

§ 162b. Of the examples of ל as the marker of direct object, the preposition in B Gen 4,5 is for contrast's sake, and in C Gen 35,9 the verb is participial. Some more genuine cases are: D Gen 44,18 לדינה [סאיבן]; A Exod 22,24 לתפון לעמין ית מסכיניה.

Thomas STAUBLI, *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 107). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991. XII-308 p. 125 Abb. und 3 Falttafeln. 23,3 × 16,5. SFr 98,—

Wie “nomadisch” waren die Vorfahren des biblischen Israel? Zwar gibt das vorliegende Buch, eine bei O. Keel gefertigte Dissertation, auf diese kontroverse Frage keine Antwort, wer sich aber an der Diskussion beteiligen möchte, ist gut beraten, sich mit seinem Inhalt vertraut zu machen. Es besteht primär aus einer überreichen Sammlung von Bilddokumenten (vom 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. bis zu byzantinischen Bodenmosaiken) aus Syrien-Palästina und seinen Nachbarkulturen (einschliesslich Altsüdarabiens, wobei in diesem Fall sehr unsichere bzw. ungenaue Datierungen der noch kaum entwickelten sabäischen Archäologie etwas zu unkritisch übernommen wurden [Abb. 61, 81-85], die derart systematisch bislang weder zusammengestellt noch diskutiert worden sind. Der Ideologie-Charakter des jeweiligen Bildprogramms wird sachkritisch angemessen herausgestellt. Das Buch reiht sich damit würdig in eine Reihe neuerer exegetischer und historischer Untersuchungen ein, die auf der Rekonstruktion der jeweiligen Text-Welt bzw. Bild-Welt der antiken Quellen als Voraussetzung für deren Verwertung zur Rekonstruktion der vergangenen realen Welt insistieren.

Die grösste Schwäche der Arbeit ist zugleich einer ihrer Vorzüge: ich meine den Verzicht auf einen präzisen Nomaden-Begriff, der es St. erlaubt, Jäger-Sammler, Ziehbauern, Wüsten-Zigeuner, Transhumante, bäuerliche Grossherdenhalter, Lohnhirten und Beduinen zwischen zwei Buchdeckeln zu vereinen (ähnlich H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn I* [Göttingen 1984] 124, dessen Nomadenbegriff R. Albertz, *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit I* [Göttingen 1992] 110, Anm. 15 als “völlig verwaschen” charakterisiert). Indem St. “Nomade” nennt, was nach Ansicht von Ägyptologen, Assyriologen und Alttestamentlern von den alten Ägyptern, Babyloniern, Assyriern, Israeliten “Nomade” genannt wurde, hat er eine zu einem verbreiteten, unscharfen Nomadenkonzept nicht nur eine wertvolle Materialsammlung zusammengestellt, sondern dem kritischen Leser zugleich die Fallibilität dieses Konzepts (bzw. dieser Konzeptionslosigkeit) *ad oculos* demonstriert. Nach der Lektüre des Buches bin ich überzeugt als zuvor, dass man den Begriff des “Nomaden” sinnvollerweise auf den “nichtsesshaften viehzüchtenden Stamm” beschränken muss, den es vor dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. nicht gegeben hat (cf. schon Rez., *ZDMG*.S 6 [Stuttgart 1985] 130-132 und “Bedouin and Bedouin States”, *ABD* I [1992] 634-638). Nomadentum ist eine Form der ethnischen Arbeitsteilung (und setzt eine imperialistisch dominierte Welt-Marktwirtschaft voraus); Nomadentum liegt nicht vor bei familiärer Arbeitsteilung (wie bei den Familien der Patriarchen; 143) und auch nicht bei gesellschaftlicher Arbeitsteilung (den Lohnhirten der Grossherdenhalter Ijob, Abraham, Nabal; 238-244). Die Merkmale “Viehzucht in Monokultur” und “Nichtsesshaftigkeit” fehlen bei den Stämmen von Mari

(Bauernstämme mit viehzüchtenden, transhumierenden Segmenten), und die Merkmale "Stamm" und "Monokultur" bei den *ššw* Palästinas. Der Entwicklung der Sache "Nomade" folgt die Entwicklung einer zugehörigen Begrifflichkeit. Arabisch 'arab "Nomade" konnte bei Assyern, Aramäern, Israeliten und Sabäern seit dem 9. Jh. v. Chr. zum Ethnonym werden, weil deren Lebensweise den alten Kulturen so fremd (und neu) war wie das Wort, mit dem diese Nomaden sie bezeichneten. Einen Begriff für "Nomade" gibt es dann auch im AT, aber ganz spät und als arabisches Lehnwort: *'hly mqnh* "Herden-Leute" 2 Chr 14,14 (aus arab. *'ahl*; bei St. nicht diskutiert, der den Begriff S. 252 mit "Hirtenzelte" übersetzt). Hingegen meint das altägyptische "Sandbewohner" jeden, der nicht auf Nilschlamm lebt, auch die Bewohner der ummauerten Siedlungen des frühbronzezeitlichen Palästina. Statt "Nomaden" bespricht St. notgedrungen Ethnonyme (und Toponyme), die von der Forschung (aber nicht in jedem Fall von St. selbst) für die Bezeichnung nomadischer Stämme gehalten wurden/werden (158-173).

Anhand von drei hier behandelten Komplexen lässt sich zeigen, dass in diesen (und anderen) Fällen das "Nomadentum" der Dargestellten ein (falsches) Interpretament, kein Sachverhalt auf der Ebene der Quelle ist. Dass in Benī Ḥasan Anfangs des 19. Jh.v.Chr. "bergbaukundige... Asiaten" (34) aus Süd- oder Ostpalästina dargestellt sind, geht aus dem "amoritischen" Namen ihres Anführers \*Abīšar(r) ebenso wie aus den Rekrutierungspraktiken der Ägypter für ihre Sinai-Unternehmungen hervor — dass diese Asiaten "nomadisierten" und "vom Stamm Abischais" waren (ebd.), hingegen aus keinem Wort (oder Bild). Dargestellt ist ein Besuch des Häuptlings selbst (nimmt man die Beischrift wörtlich) mit Familie und Gefolge. Ein Häuptling kommt nicht mit leeren Händen (während die Ägypter ihrerseits an den Rohstoffen interessiert waren, zu deren Gewinnung sie ihn mit seinem Gefolge u. U. in Südpalästina angeworben hatten). Auch die mitgebrachten Wüstentiere lassen sich hinreichend als Prestige-Geschenke erklären und bilden keinen Hinweis auf berufsmässige Jagd der Dargestellten, Dass es sich um schweifende Jäger oder Viehzüchter handelt, macht die reiche Kleidung der Frauen ebenso unwahrscheinlich wie die Bezeichnung des Anführers als "Herrscher eines Fremderlandes" und der (kostbare!) Kompositbogen in der Hand eines seiner Begleiter. Darum ist der Vergleich mit den rezenten "Wüstenzigeunern" (arab. *šlīb*) (34f.) nicht glücklich, sind diese doch durch Armut (und Lederkleidung) charakterisiert. So gewiss in den "Wüstenzigeunern" Reste vor-beduinischer arabischer (Bevölkerungen oder) Lebensweisen aufgegangen sind, so gewiss sind sie in ihrer bekannten Erscheinung vom entwickelten Beduinentum abhängig, dass den Abnehmerkreis ihrer Produkte bildet. Randständige, versprengte Reste ehemaliger Stämme hat es sicher auch in biblischer Zeit gegeben (hier mag man durchaus an die Keniter denken; 150-156), aber in Benī Ḥasan sind keine dargestellt.

Nichts "Nomadisches" hat auch der "Mann auf dem Esel" an sich. Die Siegel und die Terrakotta Abb. 2 (aus Zeraqōn, einer ummauerten Siedlung der FB III-Zeit innerhalb der 400 mm-Isohyete, also keineswegs in der "dimorphen Zone" [102] führen in einen städtischen Kontext, ebenso

die vergoldete Dolchscheide aus Byblos (Abb. 20). Auch bei den Eselreitenden Häuptlingen in Serābī el-Hādem (Abb. 16-18; S. 106) handelt es sich keineswegs um dort "ansässige Nomadenfürsten", sondern um Häuptlinge aus Südpalästina (äg. *rēnw*; Abb. 16), z. B. aus Horma (Rez., *Midian* [Wiesbaden 1988] 115f). Auch wenn das Bildmotiv nach der Hyksos-Zeit nicht mehr belegt ist (cf. aber B. Rothenberg [ed.], *The Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna* [London 1988] Fig. 53:5), tragen frühe Texte des AT zu seiner Interpretation bei: Ri 5,10; 12,13. Der Esel ist im Rahmen einer bäuerlichen Subsistenz-Wirtschaft ein reines Prestige-Objekt. Esel geben weder Wolle noch Milch (und werden in vielen Kulturen auch nicht gegessen). So wurde Esel-Haltung und Esel-Reiten spätestens im 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. zum Charakteristikum des Stammes-, aber auch des städtischen Aristokraten, und überlebte mit diesem Symbolwert in konservativen Nischen die Einführung des Pferdes im Laufe des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. Nach dem Aufkommen von Pferd und Wagen ist einer bäuerlichtribalen Konnotation des "Eselreiters" zuzustimmen, eine "nomadische" hat nie existiert.

Bei der Wiedervorlage der von Lagerfeuerromantik geprägten traditionellen Sicht der "gefährdeten Ahnfrau" (236-238) vermisst man die Berücksichtigung neuerer redaktions- und sozialgeschichtlicher Einsichten (cf. P. Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch* [Berlin 1977]; id., "Ahnfraugeschichten", NBL I/1 [1988] 67). Weder die Bedrohung durch Hunger noch die Angst vor der Zivilisation ("Unmoral der Städte") ist auf *nomadische* Landbewohner beschränkt. Die Texte sind voneinander literarisch abhängig und kein Beleg einer "nomadischen Sage". Ihrer Lebensweise sind Abraham und Isaak in JE dem Nabal von Maon Vergleichbarer Grossgrundbesitzer und Grossherdenhalter mit Lohnhirten, spiegeln also die soziale Entwicklung im Juda des 8. und 7. Jh.v.Chr. (und die Stellung der Landaristokraten zu den Metropolen der Küstenebene, die den wichtigsten Markt für ihre Überschüsse bildeten).

Die kritischen Rückfragen sollen nicht vergessen lassen, dass hier ein seit langem notwendiger, sinnvoller und weiterführender Beitrag zur Forschung vorliegt. Rez. hat aus dem Buch viel und dankbar gelernt, nicht nur durch die Provokation zu gelegentlichem Widerspruch. Die Widerlegung der beliebten Rückführung des eisenzeitlichen Vierraumhauses auf ein Nomadenzelt (209-214) ist ebenso gelungen wie die Zurückweisung eines vermeintlichen biblischen "Nomaden-Ideals" (258). Die hier mit grosser Hingabe und Liebe zum Detail zusammengestellten Funde und Befunde bleiben auch dann beachtenswert und diskussionswürdig, wenn man Realität und Relevanz der Nomaden im AT und im Alten Orient in manchen Punkten anders sieht als der Verfasser.

Wissenschaftlich-Theologisches Seminar  
Kisselgasse 1  
D-6900 Heidelberg

E.A. KNAUF

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense XLIII

The forty-third Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense will be held from August 8 to 10, 1994, at the Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium). The theme is "The Letters to the Corinthians". Proposals for short presentations should be sent to the Chairman:

Prof. Dr. Reimund Bieringer  
Minderbroedersstraat 15  
B-3000 Leuven  
Belgium

Telephone: 0032 16 283832 (w) or 204478 (h)  
Fax: 0032 16 283858

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1992-1993. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 343, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	17	279	31	327
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	16	16
Universi	17	279	47	343
Nationes	66		Alumni	343
Dioceses	169		Alumni	178
Inst. Religiosorum	40		Alumni	121
Inst. Religiosarum	9		Alumnae	9
Ex statu laicali	35		Alumnae	20
			Alumni	15

## Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

DIAZ RODELAS, Juan Miguel (26.03.93). *La novedad de Rom 7,7–8,4 en el conjunto de la reflexión paulina sobre la ley* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: A. VANHOYE.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

VICENT, Rafael, *Interpretaciones de la fiesta de sukkot en el judaísmo antiguo*. Del texto bíblico al targum y midrás. Roma 1993 (extractum).

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense XLIII

The forty-third Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense will be held from August 8 to 10, 1994, at the Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium). The theme is "The Letters to the Corinthians". Proposals for short presentations should be sent to the Chairman:

Prof. Dr. Reimund Bieringer  
Minderbroedersstraat 15  
B-3000 Leuven  
Belgium

Telephone: 0032 16 283832 (w) or 204478 (h)  
Fax: 0032 16 283858

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1992-1993. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 343, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	17	279	31	327
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	16	16
Universi	17	279	47	343
Nationes	66		Alumni	343
Dioceses	169		Alumni	178
Inst. Religiosorum	40		Alumni	121
Inst. Religiosarum	9		Alumnae	9
Ex statu laicali	35		Alumnae	20
			Alumni	15

## Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

DIAZ RODELAS, Juan Miguel (26.03.93). *La novedad de Rom 7,7–8,4 en el conjunto de la reflexión paulina sobre la ley* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: A. VANHOYE.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

VICENT, Rafael, *Interpretaciones de la fiesta de sukkot en el judaísmo antiguo*. Del texto bíblico al targum y midrás. Roma 1993 (extractum).

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

**Abel, Olivier – Smyth, Françoise** (sous la direction de), *Le Livre de Traverse*. De l'exégèse biblique à l'anthropologie (Patrimoines). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992. 291 p. 14,5 × 23,5. FF 135

**Ahlström, Gösta W.**, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (JSOT Supplement Series 146). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 990 p. 14 × 22. £60.00 – \$90.00

**Alonso Schökel, Luis, S.J.**, *Piantata in terra, toccava il cielo*. Meditazioni bibliche (Bibbia e Preghiera 15). Roma, Edizioni ADP, 1993. 202 p. 14,5 × 21. Lit. 18.000

**Bastiaens, J. Ch.**, *Interpretaties van Jesaja 53*. Een intertextueel onderzoek naar de lijdende Knecht in Jes 53 (MT/LXX) en in Lk 22:14-38, Hand 3:12-26, Hand 4:23-31 en Hand 8:26-40 (TFT-Studies 22). Tilburg, Tilburg University Press, 1993. xiii-471 p. 17 × 24. Dfl 65,—

**Bergmeier, Roland**, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus*. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen. Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993. 175 p. 15 × 23

**Berry, Donald K.**, *The Psalms and their Readers*. Interpretive Strategies for Psalm 18 (JSOT Supplement Series 153). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 160 p. 14 × 22. £24.50 – \$40.00

**Beyer, Rolf**, *König Salomo*. Vom Brüdermörder zum Friedensfürsten. Bergisch Gladbach, Gustav Lübbe Verlag, 1993. 344 p. 15 × 22. DM 42.—

*La Bible au fil des Jours*. Méry-sur-Oise, Sator – Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 384 p. 15 × 21,5. FF 169

**Blanchard, Yves-Marie**, *Aux sources du canon, le témoignage d'Irénée* (Cogitatio Fidei 75). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 363 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 170



**Blenkinsopp, Joseph**, *Une histoire de la prophétie en Israël*. Depuis le temps de l'installation en Canaan jusqu'à la période hellénistique (Collection Loi et Évangile 4). Saint-Laurent, Éditions Fides, 1993. 354 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$34.95

**Bloomquist, L. Gregory**, *The Function of Suffering in Philippians* (JSNT Supplement Series 78). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 235 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$60.00

**Bourg, Dominique – Lion, Antoine** (sous la direction de), *La Bible en Philosophie*. Approches contemporaines (Sciences humaines et religions). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 165 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 95

**Bovon, François**, *Nouvel Age et foi chrétienne*. Un dialogue critique à partir du Nouveau Testament. Aubonne, Éditions du Moulin, 1992. 85 p. 12,5 × 18

**Brenner, Athalya** (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to the Song of Songs* (The Feminist Companion to the Bible 1). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 288 p. 14 × 21,5. £17.50 – \$26.50

**Brettler, Marc – Fishbane, Michael** (eds.), *Minḥah le-Nahum*. Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday (JSOT Supplement Series 154). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 337 p. 14 × 22. £50.00 – \$75.00

**Brown, Dennis**, *Vir Trilinguis*. A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome. Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1992. 229 p. 15 × 23

**Brown, Raymond E.**, *101 Questions sur la Bible et leurs réponses* (Lire la Bible 98). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 213 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 98

**Campbell, Antony F. – O'Brien, Mark A.**, *Sources of the Pentateuch*. Texts, Introductions, Annotations. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1992. XIX-266 p. 21 × 23

**Carbone, Sandro Paolo – Rizzi, Giovanni**, *Le Scrittura ai tempi di Gesù*. Introduzione alla LXX e alle antiche versioni aramaiche (Testi e Commenti 1). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1992. 154 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 18.000

**Cassidy, Richard J.**, *John's Gospel in New Perspective*. Christology and the Realities of Roman Power. Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1992. xi-132 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Charette, Blaine**, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNT Supplement Series 79). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. 184 p. 14 × 22. £27.50 – \$50.00

**Charles, J. Daryl**, *Literary Strategy in the Epistle of Jude*. Scranton, University of Scranton Press – London and Toronto, Associated University Presses, 1993. 258 p. 16 × 24. \$39.50

*The Collegeville Bible Commentary*. Old Testament. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. xvi-858 p. 17,5 × 22,5. \$19.95

*The Collegeville Bible Commentary*. New Testament. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. p. xii-861-1300. 17,5 × 25,5. \$14.95

**Craven, Toni**, *The Book of Psalms* (Message of Biblical Spirituality 6). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. 172 p. 14 × 21,5. £7.99

**Denning-Bolle**, Sara, *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature*. Expression, Instruction, Dialogue (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux" 28). Leiden, Ex Oriente Lux, 1992. xv-199 p. 16 × 24. Dfl 65, — Dfl 45,—

**Dobbs-Allsopp**, F. W., *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (Biblica et Orientalia 44). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993. xiv-228 p. 16,5 × 24

*L'Évangile sans frontières*. L'Évangile de Luc. Traduction sur le texte grec par Charles **Augrain**. Paris, Médiaspaul, 1992. xi-115, xiii-115, xi-115, x-117, ix-117 p. 10,5 × 15

**Evans**, Craig A., *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody. Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. xv-281 p. 16 × 23,5

**Evans**, Craig A. — **Sanders**, James A. (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNT Supplement Series 83, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1) Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 296 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 — \$60.00

**Fanin**, Luciano, *Come Leggere «Il Libro»*. Lineamenti di Introduzione biblica (Strumenti di Scienze Religiose). Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1993. 221 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 20.000

**Fischbach**, Stephanie M., *Totenerweckungen*. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung (FzB 69). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1992. xiv-345 p. 15,5 × 23,5. DM 48,— — ÖS 374,40

**Fitzmyer**, Joseph A., *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York — Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1992. xviii-201 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$8.95

**Garrison**, Roman, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity* (JSNT Supplement Series 77). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 177 p. 14 × 22. £22.50 — \$35.00

**Getty**, Mary Ann, *Lettere ai Corinzi* (La Bibbia per tutti 32). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1993. 179 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 15.000

**González Lamadrid**, Antonio, *Las tradiciones históricas de Israel* (El Mundo de la Biblia). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1993. 297 p. 12 × 20. Ptas 1.500

**Grant**, Robert M., *Heresy and Criticism*. The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature. Louisville, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. x-180 p. 16 × 23,5. \$17.00

**Gundry**, Robert H., *Mark*. A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross. Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992. lv-1069 p. 16 × 23,5. \$59.99

**Halpern**, Baruch — **Hobson**, Deborah W. (eds.), *Law, Politics and Society in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 1993. 291 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 — \$70.00

**Havener**, Ivan, *Lettere ai Tessalonicesi, Filippesi, Filemone, Colossesi, Efesini* (La Bibbia per tutti 33). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1993. 148 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 15.000

**Hellwig**, Monika K., *What Are the Theologians Saying NOW? A Retrospective on Several Decades*. Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992. kvii-170 p. 13 × 20. £6.99

*Historia Episodica: Rut, Tobias, Judit y Ester.* Texto y Comentario (El Mensaje del Antiguo Testamento 10). Texto Bíblico: La Casa de la Biblia; Comentario: Enrique Cabezudo Melero. Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1992. 207 p. 11,5 × 17

**Hong, In-Gyu,** *The Law in Galatians* (JSNT Supplement Series 81). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 235 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$60.00

**Houlden, J. L.,** *Ethics and the New Testament.* Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1992. x-134 p. 14 × 21,5. £8.95

**Houston, Walter,** *Purity and Monotheism.* Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law (JSOT Supplement Series 140). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 314 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 – \$70.00

**Hubbard, Robert L. et al. (eds.),** *Studies in Old Testament Theology.* Historical and Contemporary Images of God and God's People. Dallas, Word Publishing, 1992. 333 p. 16,5 × 24

**Jagersma, H. – Vervenne, M. (eds.),** *Inleiding in het Oude Testament.* Kampen, J. H. Kok, 1992. 322 p. 16 × 24

**Jaki, Stanley L.,** *Genesis 1 through the Ages.* London, Thomas More Press, 1992. xii-317 p. 13,5 × 21,5. Cloth: \$16.95; paper: \$9.95

**Jaramillo Rivas, Pedro,** *La Injusticia y la Opresión en el Lenguaje Figurado de los Profetas* (Institución San Jerónimo 26). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1992. xvii-328 p. 16 × 24

**Keener, Craig S.,** *Paul, Women & Wives.* Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. xviii-350 p. 14 × 21,5

**Kim, Jichan,** *The Structure of the Samson Cycle.* Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993. xvii-464 p. 16 × 24

**Kleinig, John W.,** *The Lord's Song.* The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles (JSOT Supplement Series 156). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 236 p. 14 × 22. £25.00 – \$40.00

**Leclercq, Jean,** *Regards monastiques sur le Christ au moyen age.* (Jésus et Jésus-Christ 56). Paris, Desclée, 1993. 251 p. 15 × 22,5

**Lelièvre, André – Maillot, Alphonse,** *Commentaire des Proverbes.* Les Proverbes de Salomon chapitres 10-18 (LD Commentaires 1). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993. 300 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 180

**Leonardi, Giovanni,** *Apostoli al Femminile.* Le discepole del Signore nelle prime comunità cristiane (Lampada ai miei passi 4). Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1992. 204 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 18.000

**Levine, Baruch A.,** *Numbers 1-20.* A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible 4). New York, Doubleday, 1993. xvi-578 p. 16,5 × 24. \$40.00

**Malina, Bruce J. – Rohrbach, Richard L.,** *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels.* Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1992. viii-422 p. 15,5 × 23

**Mason, Steve,** *Josephus and the New Testament.* Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. 248 p. 14 × 21,5

**Mickelsen, A. Berkeley – Mickelsen, Alvera M.,** *Understanding Scripture.* How to Read and Study the Bible. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. xi-141 p. 14 × 21,5

**Muffs**, Yochanan, *Love and Joy*. Law, Language and Religion in Ancient Israel. New York and Jerusalem, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992. xxvii-240 p. 16 × 23,5

**Nau**, Arlo J., *Peter in Matthew*. Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise... with an Assessment of Power and Privilege in the Petrine Office. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. xvi-184 p. 13,5 × 21. \$12.95 – £10.50

**Neveu**, Louis, p.s.s., *Au Pas des Psaumes*. Lecture organique à trois voix: Tome IV (Cahiers du Centre de Linguistique et Littérature Religieuses 11). Angers, L'Université Catholique de l'Ouest, Institut de Perfectionnement en Langues Vivantes, 1993. 265 p. 16 × 24

**Osborn**, Eric, *The Emergence of Christian Theology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. xvii-334 p. 14,5 × 22. £35.00 – \$59.95

**Pascasius Radbertus**, *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum Iacob et Moysi* (CChr Continuatio Mediaevalis 96). Cura et Studio Bedae **Paulus**, O.S.B. Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. xv-141 p. 16 × 23,5

**Pascasius Radbertus**, *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum Iacob et Moysi* (CChr Continuatio Mediaevalis 96; Instrumenta Lexicologica Latina 76). Cura et Studio Bedae **Paulus**, O.S.B. Turnhout, Brepols, 1993. 39 p. 15,5 × 24,5

**Penkower**, Jordan S., *New Evidence for the Pentateuch Text in the Aleppo Codex* (Sources and Studies 6). Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992. 144 p. 17 × 24,5

**Peretto**, Elio, *La sfida aperta*. Le strade della violenza e della nonviolenza dalla Bibbia a Lattanzio. Roma, Edizioni Borla, 1993. 348 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 40.000

**Pérez Rodríguez**, Gabriel, *La infancia de Jesús* (Mt 1-2; Lc 1-2) (Teología en diálogo 4). Salamanca, Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1990. 266 p. 11,5 × 18,5

**Péter-Contesse**, René, *Lévitique 1-16* (Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament IIIa). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1993. 267 p. 18 × 24. SFr 45,—

**Piñero**, Antonio, *El Otro Jesús*. Vida de Jesús según los Evangelios Apócrifos. Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1993. 185 p. 13,5 × 21

**Porter**, Stanley E. – **Carson**, D. A. (eds.), *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics*. Open Questions in Current Research (JSNT Supplement Series 80). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 217 p. 14 × 22. £35.00 – \$60.00

**Power**, David N., *The Eucharistic Mystery*. Revitalising the Tradition. Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992. xiii-370 p. 16 × 23,5. £17.99

**Scullion**, John J., *Genesis*. A Commentary for Students, Teachers, and Preachers (Old Testament Studies 6). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. xviii-376 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$19.95 – £13.99

**Segalla**, Giuseppe, *Evangelo e Vangeli*. Quattro evangeli, quattro Vangeli, quattro destinatari (La Bibbia nella Storia 10). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1993. 400 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 42.000

**Simian-Yofre**, Horacio, *El desierto de los dioses*. Teología e Historia en el libro de Oseas. Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1993. 286 p. 15 × 23

**Squires**, John T., *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (SNTS Monograph Series 76). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. x-233 p. 14,5 × 22. £30.00

**Syrén, Roger**, *The Forsaken First-Born*. A Study of a Recurrent Motif in the Patriarchal Narratives (JSOT Supplement Series 133). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1993. 159 p. 14 × 22. £27.50 – \$45.00

**Theissen, Gerd**, *Social Reality and the Early Christians*. Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament. Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1993. xvi-303 p. 16 × 24. £19.95

**Tov, Emanuel**, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press – Assen/Maastricht, Van Gorcum, 1992. xl-456 p. 16 × 24

*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 25 (Pars II). *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*. 9. Lieferung Hbr 10,28-11,37. Hrsg. H. **Frede**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1991. pp. 1477-1556. 24 × 32

*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 25 (Pars II). *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos*. 10. Lieferung Hbr 11,37-13,10. Hrsg. H. **Frede**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1991. pp. 1537-1636. 24 × 32

**Vigne, Daniel**, *Christ au Jourdain*. Le Baptême de Jésus dans la tradition judéo-chrétienne (EB 16). Paris, J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>, Éditeurs, 1992. 362 p. 16 × 24. FF 430

**Walls, Neal H.**, *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth* (SBL Dissertation Series 135). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1992. xi-256 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$29.95 (\$19.95); paper: \$19.95 (\$14.95)

**Watson, Duane F.** (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry*. Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy (JSNT Supplement Series 50). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1991. 390 p. 14 × 22. £40.00 – \$60.00

**Weinberg, Joel**, *The Citizen-Temple Community* (JSOT Supplement Series 151). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1992. 145 p. 14 × 22. £25.00 – \$45.00

**Zannoni, Arthur E.**, *The Old Testament*. A Bibliography (Old Testament Studies 5). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 1992. x-277 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$17.95 – £12.50

**Zimmer, Christoph**, “*Deus*”. Logische Syntax und Semantik (Forum Theologiae Linguisticae 20). Linguistica Biblica Bonn, 1991. 105 p. 15 × 21,8 DM 19,—

ISSN 0006-0887

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---



---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

---

Finito di stampare il 25 giugno 1993  
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana  
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma